

Wiltshire County Record Office, paper copies, in order as provided by the archive: 2057/F4/65, /66, /67, /68, 494 pages

initialed letter, 5ff, pen {black-edged} 2057/F4/65

1 Upper Harley St
1 June 1854

[8:655-56]

Dearest

I am sorry that I have little satisfactory to tell you, good or bad, about St. Bartholomew's. But you will find it, as I do, impossible to bring people "up to the scratch" -

[12:92]

I think the best plan would be for Mr. Herbert to write a line to Mr. Bentley, the Treasurer, who lives at St. Barthw's,

& is a really honest, industrious Treasurer, & ask him to come & tell him all about it -

Mr. Bentley would be glad to be helped, & whatever he chose to let out, would be of value -

My own feeling, however, is that it is best not to mix up this question of the Nurses with that of Dr. Kirkes - The latter will not thank you for it - & it will do

his Election no good to have it mixed up with the general question of the glaring abuses of Hospitals "en masse" -

I have seen one of the most useful and independent officials of St. B's today - but he retracted almost all that he has ever said before, through fear of its being made use of - He would only say that the subject of the Nurses required a

thoro' systematic revolution, & that it was no use correcting (or enlarging upon) details.

With regard to these details, I find some things amended since two years ago, entirely thro' this Mr. Bentley's influence - The day=nurses still sleep in the wooden cages - but the night=nurses have rooms allotted to them to sleep in *in the day* at the top of the house. The Nurses are still as

-2-

disrespectable as ever -
 The Sisters are only
 respectable, not
 religious - Though there
 are now 4 Chaplains,
 the patients are not
 individually visited. The
 Chaplain reads prayers
 between the 2 wards,
 which is mere mockery.
 Every time a Patient
 wishes to be visited
 individually, he is obliged
 to send down a printed
 Card by the Sister to
 the Chaplain - called
 the "Chaplain's Card".

And it used to be
 constantly my lot to
 hear the jubilation of
 the R. Catholic & the
 Dissenter Patients, "Look at *our*
 Priest", or "at *our* Minister".
 contrasting his zeal with
 the Ch. of England's -

The "dressers" do not
 give any fee to the
 Hospital, but to the
 Surgeon, whose pupils
 they are - & who
 recommends them every
 year to the Board,
 which nominates them

~~With the present staff
of which~~

If you chose to separate
the two subjects of the
Nurses & Dr. Kirkes,
I would try & see Mr.
Bentley & different
people belonging to St.
B's *promiscuously* &
ascertain what I could -
But this the short
time does not allow -
And I believe it ~~quite~~/almost
useless to see people
officially, because they
ask What use are
you going to make of this,

& will never stand to
their words - I have
tried it a hundred times.

We have had some
very bad cases at our
"shop" & I have not
been in my bed for a
fortnight - I am afraid
it will be quite
impossible for me to
rout out St. Bartholomew
for another ~~month~~/fortnight - & I
do think the two questions
had better be treated
apart - I do not see
how exposure of the
general abuses of Hospls

will influence the
Election of Dr. Kirkes -

Will you thank Mr.
A' Court for his note
& his tidings of you &
the Bab & believe me
ever, dearest, yours

F.N.

[end 12:93]

unsigned memorandum, undated, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/65

The organization of the Sanitary service, (not one step in which has yet been taken,) will consist of

1. Directions for enquiries & inspections
2. Reports
Application of Regulations
3. General Instructions
Manual
Forms
Instructions for specific cases.
Directions for specific enquiries
as to causes of disease
Recommendations for each
specific case -
4. Sanitary deductions from
Statistics.
5. Ascertaining the present
Sanitary knowledge in
the Department by reference
to back reports.
[This will not take long]
6. Ascertaining the present
Sanitary practice [nor this]
7. Keeping Sanitary books
& records -

{in another hand: 1858 - Miss Nightingale - Things to be done to organize Sanitary Service}

initialed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand: To Lady Herbert - Miss Nightingale - March 23. 61 - on the question of Ventilation & the new grates} 2057/F4/65 [8:673]

30. Old Burlington Street. {printed address:}
W.

Mar 23/61 [16:400]

Dearest

Thank you 1000
times for your splendid
Amms & Rhododendrons
& flowers.

==== I am sure you
will be glad to hear
that my father is
coming to see me
next week -

==== As for Galton,
if he said *himself*

to P Herbert that
"the ventilation was
"of no use without
"the grates" (and if
this was not a speech
made for him by
Baring) there is no
meaning in words.

He writes:-

"Baring has stopped
"all ventilation, till
"the grates have had
"another year's trial.
"It is just what I

"feel will happen as
 "soon as Ld Herbert
 "goes. All these
 "Sanitary improvements
 "are only skin deep
 " - and the whole
 "thing will revert
 "to what it was
 "before".

 This is exactly
 my own opinion -

 But what I
 want to do now is
 to get *back* our
 £10,000 in the
 Estimates (taken for

ventilation) or whatever
 the sum is -

 If P Herbert
 would answer the
 Minute in this way: -
 take the £10,000
 for ventilating shafts
 & inlets - & wait the
 result of the trials
 with the altered grates
 before putting in any
 more -

 This is the only
 common sense. What
 Baring says, & Galton,
 (if he did say it), is
 not common sense
 ever yours F.N.

[end 8:675]

If P Herbert should wish to act upon the idea of separating the ventilation from the grates, - the rationale of the thing is this: -

Ventilation is required all the year round - Warming (by the excessively hot grates) only in the winter & only in such a very severe winter as the last*

* It is not pretended that Galton's grates do not warm enough for ordinary winters.

Ventilation can be carried out by the shafts & inlets alone, if properly managed - even in winter.

The shafts & inlets can be closed to any extent - so that, at the worst, in the severest winter, it would be necessary only to close them for a time, while they would be in action all the rest of the year -

Why give the men Typhus in the summer because they *might*

catch cold at Christmas?

The great advantage of the shafts & inlets is that the air is kept *constantly* moving in the room. The essence of ventilation is movement rather than quantity.

Why make the ventilation of every day dependent on warming in exceptional seasons?

It is true that, in summer, when there is no fire, the *grate* inlet will supply air, but it is not requisite for

this, because the shafts & inlets ought to give enough.

The use of the grate is to warm part of the in=coming air in very cold weather, allowing the ventilation to go on without interruption. But why, because partially warmed in=coming air is good in a very severe winter - are we to have no air all the year {printed address, round - & wait upside down:} 30. Old Burlington Street.

W.

for that part of the ventilating apparatus which is adapted for winter? F.N.

[end 16:400]

initialed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/65 [8:683]

I loved him. No one
ever loved him and
served him as I
did. Others loved
him for himself,
but I knew him
& loved him for the
sake of God and
mankind. After
you, no one can
mourn him as I
do. I feel as you

do that no one can
know the greatness
of your loss

There is no
comfort but to
know how noble
he was, how you
and he were married
for eternity, how
the worst that can
happen to you is
to be separated
for a few years.

But you have a
comfort which I have
not. For you can
carry out his wishes.
While I am prevented
from his very death
itself from having
the power to carry
out his own wishes.

God bless you -
And He will bless
you -

F.N.

Aug 3/61

initialed letter fragment, 1f, pen 2057/F4/65 [8:684]

returned with
many many thanks.

I thought of you
on your wedding day
& all day.

As for me, he
takes my life with
him - My work, the
object of my life, the
means to do it, all
in one, depart
with him.

F.N.

Aug 15/61

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Aug. 17.
1861} 2057/F4/65 [8:684-85]

Hampstead NW

Aug 17/61

Dearest

I enclose exactly
what I believe to
have been his "wishes"
as to what was "to be
Galton's position in
the Office" - quoting,
as far as I could,
his own words.

The P.S. is not
essential - tho' it
would make it
more complete.

The reason why I
could not answer
yesterday is that I
had to send for
some papers concerning
it.

I hope this is
not too late for you.

The reign of
intelligence is gone
at the War Office.
The reign of muffish=
ness has begun -

Lord de Grey is
the only one (who

can) who wishes to
carry out *his* plans -

The present master
is a man without
intelligence & without
experience who opposes
all principles
because they are
new - & who cannot
even avail himself
of the knowledge &
experience of others.

The "Royal boy",
as you used to call
him, appears to
have forgotten already
the lessons he had

been so wisely taught.

Lord de Grey
stands out nobly -
And, as in this, so
in other things, is
active & *obstinate*
in following up *his*
wishes.

I wish I could
hide myself under
ground not to see
what I do see -

God bless you
ever yours
F.N.

initialed letter, 9ff, pen 2057/F4/65 [8:685-87]

Hampstead NW

Aug 29/61

Dearest, You say, "If"
I "can think of any
thing else, only to tell"
you & you "will
forward it."

I would have done
this before & thank
you - But I have
not been able to
write -

Two things which
lay at *his* heart
were: (I speak

now merely of small
administrative things:)

1. He always
recognised the fact
that the men had no
place, either in or
out of Barracks, they
could call their own.

He considered our
soldiers as his country=
men, having home=~~ty~~/like
English feelings - & that
they would seek their
homes, if *he* did
not find them for

the men, in the worst of places.

You know that one of his last official acts was to call together the Commn on Soldiers' Dayrooms & Institutes -

that the Resolutions were sent to him, as soon as they were drawn up & before the Report was signed

& that, no sooner were these Resolutions sent in, than he immediately instructed

Capt. Jackson, R.A.

(who had had successful experience in founding Soldiers' "Homes" at Gibraltar) to go to Aldershot & report to him on the facilities of forming Soldiers' "Homes" (or Institutes) there immediately.

Had he lived, I am certain (and I believe you are too,) that he would

-2-

immediately have given effect to Capt. Jackson's Report, on forming a "Home" at Aldershot in the *first* place -

He attached particular importance to Aldershot, as you know, on account of the terrible immorality of the men there.

If you could say anything most strong to Lord De Grey, from your own knowledge

of his wishes, greater than mine - I am sure it would be most true, as to his intention with regard to the Aldershot plan - And it would be one of the best tributes to his memory - to *him* who was always thinking how to improve the soldier, body & mind.

The Report of the
Commn on Day Rooms
went in yesterday -

Capt. Jackson's
Report goes in, this
week, as to Aldershot.

And he had been
farther instructed
to go to Portsmouth
about a "Home" for
the Garrison there. And
he has similarly
reported as to its
great facility.

Portsmouth, I
expect, will be done.
For it entails hardly any expence.

But Aldershot

will not, without
a helping hand
from those who loved
him - For it will be
more expensive.

2. The success of the
new "General Hospital"
arrangement at
Woolwich - begun
the very day of his
death - to which
he looked as a
school for training
Officers for "General
Hospital" service,
wherever required

-3-

in time of war - in
order to prevent the
recurrence of the
Scutari catastrophe -

He thought that
this new organization
would require its
wheels oiling for the
first two years -
But he was certain
that it would "go",
if only a little care
were given to make
the parts go easily,
upon which reference
is certain to be made

to the W.O.

He himself wished
these references to be made
to Col. Clark Kennedy,
who headed the
Commn, which
organized this new
arrangement & the
Hospital Corps - &
to whose exertions
he ascribed its
having been done
so well -

I have this in
his writing - But

I would not risk enlisting Lord De Grey's interest for the new organization, so that references should be made to him & not to Hawes, in case of friction - by mentioning Col. Clark Kennedy's name as a referee, if you judged it better not -

These are the two last points he spoke & wrote to me about.

I need hardly say that there were other more important points which lay still nearer his heart -

In the very letter, June 7, which told me of his intended resignation; - in letters & conversations before & since, - he always spoke of Lord de Grey as looking to him to *re=organize* the office. I can

-4-

scarcely bear to recall what he said & wrote, except to carry out his wish. He said, "De Grey will do it better than I." - and "De Grey understands it better than I." He even spoke & wrote of resigning, as if it were to open the way for Lord de Grey to carry

out that plan of
 "re=organization"
 of the Office, dated
 Jan 1, 1861 - in
 Ld de Grey's writing -
 & which he showed
 me on Jan 9, 1861.

You will know
 better than I whether
 to recall these things
 to Ld de Grey - whether
 it would be well
 to tell him how
 he looked to him
 only, - to do this -

which he would
 certainly have done,
 had he had time
 given him.

God knows best.
 By taking back this
 one of His servants
 to himself, He has
 put back five
 hundred thousand
 men to deteriorate
 physically, mentally,
 spiritually -

It is hard to
 say, His will be done.

=====

Let me say (for

you alone) that
 Lord de Grey is
 working nobly to
 follow in *his* steps.
 What Ld de Grey's
 weight is I do
 not know - But at
 all events he spares
 no work - On one
 occasion when the
 "Royal boy" came in
 to C. Lewis's room
 to try to upset some=
 thing which our
 master had done,

-5-

(it was the new
Woolwich Hospital)
Lord de Grey, who
happened to be
in the room: (every
thing *happens* there
now, is not systematically done, under the new
reign:) said "Sir,
it is impossible :
Lord Herbert decided
it & the Ho: of C.
voted it" and
so silenced them
both - And many
similar assertions
of *our* master's

decisions I have
heard of Lord de
Grey making -
God bless you -
ever yours
F.N.

incomplete letter & envelope, 3ff, pen, b;acl=edged paper & envelope}
2057/F4/65

32 South St
London W
Dec 12/61

[8:687-88]

Dearest I send you
a copy of Dr. Farr's
paper, read at
Manchester before
the British Association.

And I was in hopes
to have sent you a
paper of mine on
Hospital Statistics
& Hospital plans,
read at Dublin
before the Social

Science Association.
 But I have only
 this day got the
 first Proof of it
 And therefore I can
 only enclose one (the
 last) ~~sheet~~/page, which
 perhaps you may
 like to see -

You know that
 we have lost our
 poor Clough. He was
 dying when I saw
 you - But I had
 not the heart to

tell you. He died on
 November 12 at
 Florence. His wife
 had joined him a
 few months: his
 sister a few days
 before - The end
 was very rapid.
 He was a man
 of rare mind &
 temper - of the highest
 & tenderest spirit
 it has ever been my
 lot to meet - of
 uncommon genius,
 worn & fretted by

the necessity of working
 at hard & uncongenial
 matters for daily
 bread. He has left
 his poor widow &
 three children, of
 which the youngest
~~is~~/was only 3 months
 old when he died,
 in a most anxious
 position.

He was my *support*
 in life, as my dear
 master was my
object in life. "The
 righteous perisheth

-2-

"& no man layeth it
 "to heart - none
 "considering that he
 "is taken away from"
*the good he might
 have done -*

The last words I
 ever had from him
 were when he
 heard (abroad) of
 my dear master's
 death. I shall
 never hear such
 words of sympathy
 again. He felt
 so much for us all

& was so entirely
 overcome when he
 spoke of us to his
 wife that I cannot
 help believing it
 hastened his death.
 He was only 41.
 But death for him
 was not premature.

He was already
 worn out in life.
 He had worked so
 hard at Oxford
 that his peculiar
 impressionable
 temperament never
 recovered it.
 {envelope, black-edged}

The

Lady Herbert

signed letter fragment, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/65 [black-edged paper] [8:690]

He was sitting in
an arm chair by
the fire, with
some writing on his
knee. He was
looking at you
who were just
leaving the room.
When you were
gone, he said,
almost to himself,
"This is what I
call heaven -
loving love".

Aeschylus uses
the true expression
"*unloving love*."

Perhaps he was
thinking of the
difference between
this & *his* love,
when he used the
words, "*loving love*"

He so seldom
spoke of his feelings,
at least to me -
that I was the
more struck -

Florence Nightingale
This sad New Year
1862

{in another hand:}

To be kept for my Children EH

Extract from a letter of

Florence Nightingale (written by herself)
containing a statement of Sidney's
feeling regarding the happiness
of his married life.

signed letter, 2ff, pen {black-edged paper} 2057/F4/65 [8:700-01]

Sept 10/70

Dearest I feel a more
 than common union in sorrow
 with you now that you are
 so ill - we two who have
 been so united in sorrow
 for these last nine years.
 I know that you have long
 since been able to say with our
 Lord, even when your soul was
 sorrowful, even unto death:
 Father, Thy will, not mine be
 done - & that you have not
 waited till now to offer
 yourself to seek Him on the
 cross, & with every cross that
 He who uses every means to

procure us so great a good as
 that of His love shall send.
 You are not one who will be
 satisfied to hear His voice
 only from the foot of the
 mountain - Even where
 the cup is so bitter that Our
 Lord Himself says: ~~Let~~/If it be
 possible, let this cup pass
 from me: you will hold
 out both hands for it.
 It seems indeed as if He
 would try you in every way -
 & give you the opportunity of
 victories in your bed more
 pleasing to Him than even
 those of open struggle with
 evil.

Let us thank Him, even tho'
 the flesh is weak, that He treats
 us as He treated His son -
 Having desired to suffer with
 Him, let us thank Him for
 granting our prayer - When
 we think that *He* has sent ~~it~~/this,
 we know that *He* will give
 the strength to bear it. His
 strength is made perfect in
 our weakness. Our Lord
 chose the path of the Passion
 & the Cross for Himself - O that
 we may be able, of our own
 free will, to choose it too!
 that we may be able to run,
 not only with patience, but
 with joy, the appointed course
 at the end of which *He* waits

for us, *He* is expecting us.

You have now to suffer in
 everything. Pray for me, now
 that you are so suffering, that
 I may never have any other
 thought, any other feeling but
 to know & do His will.

For so many years I have
 every day been 'delivered unto
 death for Jesus' sake' - would
 I could add: that 'the *life* of
 Jesus' has been 'made manifest'
 in me!- that I feel as if I
 could unite now in prayer &
 sympathy with you, so that,
 like St. Paul, we might esteem
 ourselves happy to suffer for
 Him. God be with you always

ever yours

Florence Nightingale

incomplete letter, undated, 8ff, pen {black-edged} 2057/F4/65 [8:688-89]

-1-

The Horse Guards
have taken quite a
different tone
lately - owing, I believe,
to the "Meeting" of
the 28th.

Every one said
that *he* was the only
man in England for
whom such a
Meeting could have
been held - men
of all parties, the
representative of
the Crown, the
representative of

Parlt, uniting to
do him honour.

Mr. Rathbone
of Liverpool tells
me that they are
going to have a
similar Meeting
there - as soon as
the immediate turmoil
of this terrible
American business
has past.

You know that
Liverpool has always
stood out prominent
about *him* & about
the Crimean War

-2-

For the Statue, I have most earnestly recommended that it should be in Westminster Abbey. He deserves a place there. For he is the initiator of a new era - that of taking the *human* side of the policy as regards the soldier - looking upon him as a man & not as a machine.

After all, politics are ephemeral. And

Westminster Abbey a higher & worthier place than the House of Commons or Palace Yard.

Wiltshire does not think of building yet but of applying the funds to your Charmouth Institution.

The "Herbert" Gold medal will be for the best proficient in "preserving the soldier's health" at the Chatham School. This as a tribute to

his particular object.

The D. of Cambridge
has written to Sir G.
Lewis to ask for
the Quarter Master
Genl to be President
in *his* room of the
Barrack Commission,
(Galton, Sutherland
& Burrell, you know)
I was sorry & I was
glad. But it was
impossible to refuse
On the one hand
it shews that they
mean to keep on
the Barrack Commn,

which I never thought
they would, after *he*
was gone - & that
they mean to play
the game of treading
in his steps for the
sake of his popularity.
On the other hand, to
have Airey or Percy
Herbert in *HIS* place
& with ~~the~~/a President's
power of putting a
stop to every thing
(this Commn has had
the spending of
£50,000 a year since
1857) is very galling.

-3-

Lord de Grey works his very best at the W.O. [Sir G. Lewis is studying the Astronomy of the Ancients - profitable speculation!] Lord de Grey has the whole of the charge of this expedition to Canada. Every thing is being raised to War Establishmt. Lord de Grey applied to us to know what *he* had done in reference to the China Expeditionary Force

& followed *exactly in his steps*. And I was very glad to be able to shew how beautifully *his* "Regulations" work & meet every emergency.

Ld de Grey did exactly what *he* did; & we revised the Sanitary Instructions.

I have no doubt that this American business is one of the things which have made the Horse Guards

turn sharp round
 & think it might
 be as well for them
 if they too would
 tread a little in
his steps.

The country would
 never forgive them
 if they were to lose
 another Army (in
 Canada)

But I see more
 & more every day
 how different it is
 having only Ld de Grey
 in the W.O. He does
 his very best. But

he has no power.

He cannot remodel
 the Engineering (Fortifica
 tions) Department
 as HE had intended &
~~writes~~/written to me in his very
 last letter - And
 Galton remains *tale*
quale. You know
 that poor Godley is
 dead. Had Ld de
 Grey been powerful,
 he could have used
 this opportunity for
 remodelling in some
 degree the position
 - as I am sure he
 wished.

-4-

Let me tell you
one thing which I
think will give you
pleasure.

The Choral Society
are going to give
a series of Performances
to the Soldiers
gratuitously. I was
consulted. And they
open tonight at
Exeter Hall with
a Dirge to *his* memory
& the Messiah after
wards. It will be
a grand performance
- a great tribute to

for Ld Stanley -
And *his* work
was all for mankind!

Ld de Grey will
I think carry the
Soldiers' Day Rooms
in time. The
Commander in Chief
had taken the
Iron House at Aldershot we
wished to have
(for his Officer's
Club) But I think
the W.O. will buy
a house there for

£2000 for us -

I have recommended
that a tract
containing the
account of the
Meeting of the
28th & an address,
with appeal to the
Soldier, to be ~~got~~/done
~~from~~/by Dickens,
shall be sent to
every Soldiers' Reading Room
& every Commanding
Officer by the
W.O.

{page missing?}
the more pleasure
because I send
them to some of
his *poor* adherents
And I always tell
them they come from
Wilton; poor, poor Wilton.

I would write a
great deal more -
But I have had
two Doctors' Consultations.
And they say that, in
addition to all my
other woes, I have
now congestion of the
spine, brought on by
sorrow & worry And

Wilt/65 unsigned memorandum, undated, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/65

What the Army Medical Board ought to be able to do in this Indian case -

[15:271-72]

Nothing can save the poor troops now from a tremendous loss -

But, if there is to be a Military occupation with Queen's troops, no time should be lost in making preparations.

The first step would be to "make A. Smith a Marquis", - but, if this cannot be, the Sanitary adviser of the Consultative Board should be able to do the following:

Military authority ought to lay down all the points to be occupied -

Sanitary authority all

the points which can be healthily occupied

Hitherto, the banks of rivers have been the Military base - It is impossible to improve these Sanitarily - But there is scarcely any other situation which cannot be improved -

Military problems are like all other problems - they require common sense to solve them more than anything else - though Military men would fain persuade us otherwise.

England would not be England, if she could not, in India,

make Railways to bring troops down from the healthy positions upon the unhealthy ones which must occupied & cannot be improved - & if she could not improve the unhealthy positions which are capable of improvement.

To make troops, in India, bivouack or to put them in huts *upon the ground* in unhealthy positions is fatal - But put them in huts raised three feet above the ground, & even in unhealthy positions, much disease will be saved -

Calcutta, as far as regards the native part, is now one of the most unhealthy cities of the world - There is not a drain in it - And there is a salt marsh near it which sometimes dries up & leaves putrid fish -

But all these things might be remedied, even in India, & must be remedied, if we are to have a prolonged Military occupation, without fearful loss of European life -

But there is no time to be lost, because Railways & Sanitary works must be & must take time - After these poor troops are dead, our difficulties will begin -

[end 15:272]

unsigned memorandum, undated, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/65 [14:495]

Home Stations

Upon mean force		
annually		
Mortality	Navy	Marines
per 1000		
From Disease alone	6.8	
" Wounds & Injuries	<u>3.8</u>	
Total Mortality	10.6 under 8
		both on board ship
		& in barracks

The ~~Marines~~/Mortality of the Marines is a little worse than that of the Navy - but very little - not 1 per 1000 -

The Marines do not go aloft, & therefore their total mortality is below that of the seamen, whose deaths from external violence & drowning, by men falling from aloft &c, is 3.8 per ann. ~~(illeg)~~ per 1000, as shewn by Table -

The Total Mortality for Marines only is given, probably because that from Wounds & Injuries is hardly appreciable,

Mortality
of *Marines* -
between 7 & 8
per 1000
whether on board
ship or in Barracks.

[end 14:495]

unsigned memorandum, undated, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/65 [14:532-33]

E.g.

Foot Guards

Why the
strength of the
Invalids must
be added in
adding their
Mortality

Aggreg. Strength	Deaths
1844-52 = 44388	891
Invalids	
1845-53 = 1565	210
45953	1101
	[Mortality Per 1000]
	23.9

The aggregate Strength, 44388, of the Guards, '44-'52, yields its own proper mortality of 891. But, besides the Mortality on effectives, there is a Mortality taking place on non-effectives invalided. These Invalids are discharged at any time after the Army strength is taken - which is on April 1. They are included in the strength up to the day the Annual Return is made. But they begin to disappear & their Mortality together with them, directly the day of taking the strength has passed.

~~comes round.~~ They, afterwards, form a distinct class with a special Mortality. It is considered that one year's Mortality among these Invalids may be fairly added to the Mortality of the effectives, because the Diseases, of which they die within the year, may be fairly attributed to causes connected with their Service. In order to add this Mortality fairly, we must leave it out for the first year, & continue it a year beyond the last year, for which the Mortality of effectives is given (- the mortality in Invalids being always taken a year after they have left the service)

To do this, we must add together the *effective* strength & the mortality

for 1844-52 to the *Invalid* Mortality & strength 1845-53.

(The *Invalids'* strength must be added, because it does not exist in the *effective* strength)

It was thought doubtful whether half the *Invalids'* strength should not be added *besides*, because they may be supposed to remain under observation on an average of half the year - But it was decided that the Discharges might very well be told off on one hand against the Accessions of Strength from Recruits on the other, who will be reckoned in the Strength of the next April 1, altho' they may have been on the strength only half the year -

-2-

allowance must be made for the selection at entry, which excludes the sick.

This may be put down as nearly equivalent to half the Deaths among the Pensioners. Thus the true strength & Deaths will be about

	<i>Strength</i>	<i>Deaths</i>
Effectives	22948	454
Pensioners	876	115
Excluded }		
Sick of }	438	58
Dangerous }		
Diseases }		
	<hr/>	
	24262	627

The real annual mortality per cent of the Foot Guards, after correction, is 26 annual deaths to 1000 living - whereas the mortality of the male population at the same ages is about 9 annual deaths to 1000 - or one where there would be three in the Guards

[end 14:533]

incomplete memorandum, undated, 5ff, pen, 2057/F4/65 [14:533-34]

PRIVATE

The conclusions upon this Table are as follow:

1. that the Army Statistics give no real idea of the Mortality

There is this essential difference between the Registrar-General's & the Army Medical Returns -

The first give the precise per centage of Deaths to Population within Army Ages. The second give no precise per centage of Deaths to Army Population -

Soldiers die to the Army in two ways. viz. by death & by invaliding - The state loses them equally whether they die or are invalided before their term of service is completed.

By the table I enclose, it appears that more than 18 entire Regiments were lost to the service in 5 years -

2. that the Army Mortality, as stated in the Report, cannot be accurately compared with that of Civil Life at the same ages - To say that the Mortality

in the Guards is double that of Civil Life is to make an under = statement of the truth. For the Army Mortality merely shews the Deaths among those staying in the Service long enough to die in it. It does not shew the Deaths among those discharged to die elsewhere -

A low rate of mortality therefore may imply not a high state of health but a high rate of invaliding.

And Statistics thus organized may give all the results which Sanitary measures would give.

For, if every man likely to die were invalided, the Army would appear immortal. For not a man in it would ever die.

The table I enclose adds upwards of 15 per 1000 to the annual Rate of Mortality of the Army. It shews that, in 5 years, nearly 1 ½ Regiments were swept away within 12 months after invaliding.

And all these men were between

30 - 35 years of age - had had an average of 10 years' service. For those invalided after completing their time do not die.

The difference between the different Arms shews the method by which the apparent Mortality in some is reduced e.g. The Life Guards actually reach a Mortality of 15 per cent in the 5 years. the Horse Artillery is as low as 4 ½ per cent.

3. The result is that we have no reliable Statistics of the Army Mortality & that, without some principle in those of Invaliding, we cannot compare the rate of Mortality in our Army with that of any others - For, in some, we know that every man who dies dies in Hospital

Nor can we compare it with Civil Life.

Nor can we even compare Regiment with Regiment.

The real Statistics of the Army, to be at all brought out, must include:

(1) the adoption of an accurate nomenclature & classification of Disease & Mortality.

(2) accurate tables of invaliding, stating the Diseases & Deaths for 12 months, or such other period, if practicable, as would include the termination of the cases up to what would have been the termination of the man's ~~so~~ service - Deaths from other diseases, not contracted in service, should not be included.

(3) tables of the ~~continued influx of~~ healthy lives which at known ages - are continually drafted into the Army.

4. The true Army Mortality would then be calculated as follows:

Mortality in Army Hospitals - *plus* that from all Diseases or injuries for which men are invalided - *minus* that from Diseases or injuries taking place after what would have been the expiration of the term of service - the percentage being taken on the active Force, plus the Invalids.

[end 14:534]

	e.g.		{Deaths of Invalids
Strength	Deaths	Invalids	{within term of
			{service
10,000	100	1000	100

The Mortality would, according to present

Mayne {Glasgow [14:495-96]
 Dr. Borlase Childs write to {Liverpool
 surgeon to Police Division Inspectors {Liverpool
 ? Strand - of Police {Edinburgh
 at {Manchester
 {Birmingham

1. age of entry?
2. duration of service?
3. amount of night duty & the
 † manner in which it is performed?
4. mortality per cent per ann.
 distinguishing total mortality
 that from fevers
 cholera
 diarrhaea
 dysentery
 Consumption
 other Chest
 diseases

sickness in the Police? Rheumatism

Army

- 5 mortality in different Barracks
 of metropolis from same classes
 of disease? & ~~fr~~ total mortality?
- 6 average strength
 sickness from these diseases
- 7 per cent
- 8 amount & nature of night duty

examine
 Mayne & Dr. Fisher

Considering Police to be
 a moveable body,
 required per centage of
 mortality from all
 classes of disease
 (those of the Lungs
 especially important)
 & also current per
 centage of sickness -
 required amount
 of night duty -
 whether same men
 always on day duty
 & others always on
 night duty

examine
 Dr. Southwood Smith

required Mortality
 & Sickness in
 Model Lodging houses

Report by Waller
 Lewis

required Mortality
 & Sickness in the Post

Office

Mortality from Disease alone
in the Navy
for Seven years' average
1837 - 1843

Per 1000 Annually

Home - - - - -	6.8	
S. America - - - -	6.7	
Various - - - - -	8	
Packet Service - -	8.6	
N. Coast Spain - -8.5 - - - -		4 years' average only
Mediterranean - -	10.7	
Cape - - - - -	11	
W. Indies - - - - -	19.2	} Unhealthy Stations
E. Indies - - - - -	34.2	
W. Coast Africa - <u>57</u> }		
Annual Average	14.9	Mean Force 33,000
per 1000		[end 14:496]

[this f has a vertical line through it]

It appears from a Return given in Mr. Grainger's Report of ~~of~~ Cholera in the Metropolis in 1849, ~~published by the General Board of Health,~~ that H.M. Troops suffered in a much larger proportion than the Civil Population ~~in which~~ of the Parishes in which the Barracks were situated -

[diagonal lines through the following paragraph]

The Mortality amongst the Civil Population of St. Pancras Parish in that year was

Per 1000

2.2

~~whil~~

facts which prove that the Local predisposing causes of Cholera were of a more intense character in and around the Barracks than among the dwellings of the population generally

They would indicate the existence of effluvia ~~connected~~ proceeding from defective drainage and latrine arrangements - in addition to atmospheric impurity, proceeding from overcrowding & defective ventilation.

[there is a vertical line through the f]
 [additions in a different hand in bold]

Cholera

Proportionate Mortality of Troops & Civilians
 in the Metropolis in 1849

Civilians	Deaths per 1000	2nd Life Guards
St. Pancras	2.2	Regent's Park 10.7/4
Kensington	3.3	R.H.G 17.5
		Knightsbridge
		1st Batt. Gren. Gds
		1st Batt. Coldstream
Marylebone	2.7	Portsmouth 3.2
& St. Martin's in Fds		Trafalgar Sq.1

St. John & St. Margt		Coldstream Gds*
Westminster	6.8	Wellington 2
E. London &	5.4	2nd Batt. Colds Gds
Whitechapel		Tower " S.F.Gds.
		10
Marylebone	1.7	S.F.G. 1st Batt.
		St John's Wood 2
		{illeg Cotnam?} W

*The Wellington Barracks are situated in St. James's Park, the only healthy spot of the whole district, which is a peculiarly unhealthy one.

Assume that the aggregate strength of the-
 Foot Guards was, as in 1842 - 6 - viz.
 22948

we must add for the strength of the
 Pensioners

$$\frac{934 + (934-115)}{2} = 934-58 = 876$$

Thus making the aggregate strength for a year
 23,824 out of which
 454 effective
 115 pensioners

569 died in the year -
 Thus mortality was at the rate of
 24 in 1000 annually among the effective
 & pensioners, whereas the mortality among
 the effective alone was

$$\frac{454}{22948} = 20 \text{ in } 1000$$

But to make the comparison at all fair
 between the mortality of the Foot Guards
 & that of the General Population - some

unsigned memorandum, undated 1f, pen 2057/F4/65

Sunday -

For your Consideration
 MEDICAL branch
 Army Medical Board

[15:270-71]

I have been going over all the men, who served well in the Crimean War, as subjects for your consideration in re *Medical & Statistical* branch .
 Dr. Taylor's Division (3rd) was always the best administered - from the time you sent him out - that of Alexander ~~always~~ excepted, who also bore the burden & toil of the day, the first winter, which Taylor did not -

There are several good Regimental Officers, Longmore & others - But they are wholly untried in administration. And a very plausible subject of complaint might arise - on the parts of Messrs. Dumbreck

& Forrest, & Co, if they were passed over for a Regimental Surgeon, whereas the appointment of Taylor who has served in all parts of the world, in war as in peace, & is a tried man in administrative matters, is unexceptionable.

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale - on the re-constitution of the Army Medical Board}

unsigned memorandum, undated, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/65

-1-

For your
Consideration

STATISTICAL
branch

Taylor is a wholly untried man in this - Algebra is necessary, which Balfour has & Taylor has not. True, ~~if~~ if Alexander is Director General, ~~Taylor~~/Balfour is a very bad adviser for him, for he is opinionated, while Alexander is modest.

[15:270-71]

But Balfour has been working at this for 18 years - and could, with difficulty, be passed over -

He might still hold his position as Surgeon to the "little red men" - just as well as he does now - for he does all the Statistics now -

The real hold you have

on both *Statistical & Sanitary branch*/Heads is only the enactment which you have established your= self, ~~of~~ viz. the Quarterly publication of *Civil Registrar = General of the "deaths"*, with any comments of ~~their~~/his own. The Registrar General's Office is the most popular department of the Service And, if a Barrack shewed, e.g., no improvement in Phthisis, ~~the~~ a remark from the R.G.'s Office would bring public opinion down upon them directly. Of this, Balfour is well aware - & on this account, he kicked - in your Report.

-2-

Qy - whether it would be possible to ask for two clerks from Farr's Office, with a small increase of pay to make it worth their while to go over to the service of the W.O., and to make this an excuse for Balfour to work the first six months at the Civil Registrar = Genl's Office, under plea of Farr wishing to keep his eye upon his own Clerks -

This would start the whole thing in the way you would wish to have it started -

For the fact is, there is not a man in the Army fit for *Statistical* or *Sanitary* branch - And yet, you must have a man in the Army.

[end 15:271]

unsigned memorandum, undated, 5ff, pen 2057/F4/65

Note on the Monthly
~~Quarterly~~ Return of
 Sickness & Mortality

[9:52]

I. Two important deductions
 are drawn from this Return
 by Sir A. Tulloch

1. that acclimatization
 has "no perceptible advantage
 "in India, even when troops
 "are serving under the most
 "disadvantageous circumstances."

2. that it would be
 advantageous to send Sikh
 troops to China.

The second of these is an
 important suggestion - espe=
 cially at the present time.

But the first requires
 to be seriously examined.

1. no satisfactory
 conclusion can be drawn
 from 3 months' Statistics.
 But, as Sir A. Tulloch has
 used this period, we must
 do so too - & shew that his
 conclusion is not borne out
 by the facts.

2. he acknowledges that

the Bengal Returns are
for the 3 healthiest mon.
in the year. And yet
the Mortality was at the
rate of 39 per 1000 per ann.

Madras	54	"	"
Bombay	58	"	"

the returns for the two
last Presidencies being
for the more unhealthy
~~Stations~~ Seasons.

This fact alone destroys
his argument -

[end 9:52]

But we find another
means of comparison in
the D.G.'s Report. He says
the Bengal Mortality
for the Quarter given
was "nearly one half less"
than what took place
during the previous Quarter
This would make the
Mortality for the previous
Quarter 77 per 1000.

In Sir A. Tulloch's
Evidence before the Indian
Organization Commission,

[right column]
 p. 180, he gives the following
 ratios for 39 years -

Per 1000

Bengal -----79.2
 Madras -----62.9
 Bombay -----61.1
 All India ----70

The Bengal Winter
 quarter, ~~has~~ as deduced
 from ~~Alex~~ the D.G.'s
 account, it will be seen,
 very nearly comes up
 to Tulloch's average -

The conclusion is
 that these tables convey
 no satisfactory conclusion
 on the subject of
 acclimatization -

It would be desirable
 to obtain the Quarterly
 Ratios for all India
 during the Mutiny.

II. the ~~Quarterly~~/Monthly Form
 might be so improved
 as to give a larger amount

[left column]

of such information as
the S. of S. requires.

(1) The *Barracks* occupied
by the Troops in Gt Britain
& Ireland should be given.

(2) Instead of adding the
"Remaining" & "Admissions"
together & calling that
the "Total Treated", the
"Average Daily Sick"
should be given, which
would shew the amount
of inefficiency from disease.

(3) The Classification of
Diseases should be
exchanged for the classi=
fication on "No. 1
"Administrative Form,
"(Morning State)" contained
in the new Regulations.

(4) In stating the Per
centages, the amount
per 1000 per annum
should be given -
instead of "1 in 7"
which is simple nonsense -

[right col]

(5) The Annual Percentage of Death to Strength should also be given.

(6) The columns of "Increase" & "Decrease" "in the month" are useless; because 1. the event to which they refer is past & no conclusion can be drawn from it. 2. they might lead to erroneous conclusions as to the healthiness of a Regiment. e.g. we find in one Column a decrease of 17 Admissions. Sir J. Hall made use of this very fact in the Crimea to congratulate the Commander of the Forces on the "improving health" of ~~the~~/his Army, at the very time an epidemic was pending.

III. The Mortality in China has been enormous & requires strict enquiry.
2. The returns fully bear out the immense impor=

[left column]

tance of the prevention of
Zymotic Diseases on
foreign Stations. These
Diseases occasion far
the largest amount of
sickness, mortality &
inefficiency.

3. Should not the S. of [S.? side of sheet cut off]
obtain the Monthly
Statistics of every one
of the Foreign Stations
to enable him to ask
questions regarding
any excessive Mortality
in one or more Stations
We learn incidentally
from the D.G.'s Report
that Dysentery has
prevailed at Secunderabad
& yet the Statistics
give no information
whatever upon the
fact - Secunderabad
being included in one
General Average sweeping
[right column]

over the whole of the
Madras Presidency

Initialed letter, ff1-3, pen 2057/F4/65 [8:694]

Hampstead N.W.

Sept 7/64

Dearest

I thought your note
to Dr. Parkes just
what it ought to be.

With regard to Lady
Bath's Vill: Nurse - - - we
have quite forsworn
recommending people
for that position - we
train people whom
their future employers
recommend - This makes
the employer responsible

for her Village Nurse -
makes the employer
infinitely more wise
in her superintendence
- instead of being only
occupied as often
happens, in picking
holes in the Village
Nurse who has been
recommended to *her*;-
& who requires all
her employer's countenance
to carry out her most
difficult task.

If Lady Bath will
choose (& send us) a

woman, we will give
her 6 months' Midwifery
training - if she is to
be a Midwifery Nurse, -
at the Lying-in Ward
at King's College Hospital.
And she can also
have *general* nurse
training, if desired -
& if special arrang=
ments ~~have~~ are made.

Already in different
parts of England we
have Nurses sent
out often this fashion.

1000 thanks for game

God bless you

ever your F.

Copy of dear Flo's letter Scutari July 9/55 re Athena 2057/F4/65

Note, unsigned, ff1-7, pen 2057/F4/65

[15:427-28]

August 1859

Miss Nightingale

Chatham Soldiers

Institute

Note on the plans of

Chatham "Soldiers' Institute"

1. Object approved & plans considered as good, but too costly for the Barrack - If it were intended to rebuild the Barracks on a proper plan, the "Institute" would probably do as it is.

But, considering the miserable construction & overcrowded state of Chatham Barracks, it appears doubtful whether the money would not be better spent in increasing accommodations

2. Or the money might be spent perhaps more advantageously in providing a larger amount of cheaper &

plainer Day = room
accommodation -

3. The proposed plans
are very defective in
warming & ventilation
arrangements - and
require revision on
these points.
4. Looking at the elevation,
it is very doubtful
whether the building
could be finished for
the sum proposed, which
moreover does not include

the following order:

1. Increased Barrack
& Hospital accommodation
- and plain cheap
day=rooms in the mean
time for the men to
live in thro' the day.
2. Married Soldiers'
quarters.
3. Soldiers' Institute -
such as the one proposed -
- which is highly to be
approved of in its
proper place - so much
so that, were it so

carried out, I should
gladly furnish it, if
allowed to do so.

[end 15:428]

In conclusion, the "Institute" plans would answer excellently, except the warming & Ventilation, for a new Barrack, built on the best model and complete in its parts.

At so very incomplete a Barrack as Chatham, it would be wrong i.e. out of place.

Money is wanted at Chatham for constructive works in

furnishing.

5. While it is proposed to spend this large sum of money, we must not forget that, in almost every Barrack=room at Chatham, married women & young unmarried women sleep & live among the men. Does not this fact intimate a more pressing necessity for married quarters?

2057/F4/65 initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale March 1. 1858. Disapproves of Dr. Farr's Weekly Army Return Enclosed. Black-edged paper, 2057/F4/65

Mar 1/58

[14:556]

For this there is no hurry, at least not before you see Farr.

But his Weekly {illeg}/Return (enclosed) is in opposition to the principles of ~~the~~ your Report respecting the Army Medl Board, which principles, together with those

you expounded to me as to the adminis= tering a Board, are set forth in the enclosure with a green string -

{illeg}/A criticism on Farr's Weekly Report accompanies it -

I think it is important *not* to let it pass, as it stands -

F.N.

Would you not
talk to Sutherland
about this before
you come to any
conclusions with
Farr?

[end 14:556]

Printed title page; Florence Nightingale, *Notes on the Care and Treatment of Sick and Wounded During the Late War in the East, and On the Sanitary Requirements of the Army Generally*. Presented by Request to the Secretary of State for War. London: Harrison & Sons 1857. Begins with Panmure letter to her 18th Feb 1857.

Preface. Handwritten at top, around printed "Preface":

Dear Mr Herbert. This is the
kind of Preface I intended to put
supposing you approved, and if
you wrote me "the letter" regarding
the insertion of the Abstracts of
the Army
Medical Correspondence.
Feb 4/58. F. Nightingale

Some time after the receipt of Lord Panmure's letter of the 28th February, 1857, and when considerable progress had been made in drawing up the following Notes, I received from the Right Honourable Sidney Herbert, M.P., three large packets of MS, at three separate dates, containing a great mass of correspondence on the care of the sick and wounded, and on the sanitary state of the army in the East, which had passed between the director general, the principal medical officer of the army in the East, and medical officers of divisions, etc.

Mr Herbert also wrote me the letter, of which a copy is subjoined. [then continues as in Matters affecting.]

Note to Sidney Herbert

4 February 1858

Source: From a letter to Elizabeth Herbert, Wiltshire County Record Office, Pembroke Collection 2057/F4/65, black-edged paper [13:60-61]

1 Upper Harley St.

29 May 1854

My dearest

The chief facts
I observed, when
I used to go to St
Bartholomew's Hl
were,
1st, that the Nurses
(not the Sisters)
slept in wooden
cages on the
landing places
outside the doors

of the Wards, where
it was impossible
for any woman of
character to sleep,
where it was
impossible for the
Night Nurse, taking
her night in the
day, to sleep at all,
owing to the noise,
where there was
no light or air
but that admitted
through the glass

doors- & where
three were together
in this small space,
but/tho' only two, it is
true, slept at a
time.

2nd, it was *preferred*
that the Nurses
(again, not the
Sisters) should be
women who had
lost their characters,
i.e., who should

have had one
child, because it is

supposed, in England,
that these only can
be made to work
hard (for the sake
of the child) & be
pitiful to the Patients,
& that no other woman will take
a Hospl Nurse's place.

3rd, the excessive want
of personal cleanliness
of the Patients - they
could *never* wash
their feet - & it was
with difficulty &
only in great haste
that they could have

a drop of water
just to *dab* their
hands & face.

But these things
are just the same
in all the other
Hospitals.

I have not been
to St Bartholomew's
for two years.
If I possibly can,
I will go there
tomorrow or Wednes
day & ascertain

whether the cages
& other varieties
are there still.

The case of Dr
Kirkes is the most
flagrant we have
yet had, for his
book on Physiology
is one of our
text= books in the
Medical World.

But these are not
the only instances

of jobbing in Hospitals.

The "dressers" (who
 are students) buy
 their places, which
 are much sought
 after, as dressers,
 so that not he
 who is most skilful
 but he who has
 most money gets
 on. At Guy's
 this shameful prac=
 tice is done away
 with, but not, I

believe, at the other
 Hospitals. I will
 try & learn whether
 it is still so at
 St Bartholomew's.

I was overjoyed to
 see your handwriting
 again. God bless
 the little Bab &
 you, & believe me,
 ever yours

F.N.

Three years ago, all the
~~windows~~ front at St
 Bartholomew's was re=
 modelled & beautified,
 while the nurses were
 [breaks off abruptly]

[end 13:61]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Wiltshire 66, paper copies

67

October 2012

signed letter, 1f, pen 2057/F4/66

[14:57]

1 Upper Harley St
16 October 1854

Dear Mr. Herbert

I shall be too grateful
to see you today at the
time you mention, between
3 & 5 o'clock, if you can
spare the time to come
up here -

Yours very truly

Florence Nightingale

[end]

incomplete letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: 7 May 1855} 2057/F4/66

Harbour of Balaclava
May 7/55

[14:184]

Dear Mr. Herbert

There are many
things about Scutari
which I have long
been anxious to say
to you, though I do
not know that it is
of any use -

Not being a soldier
& being told by those
who were at Scutari
that to remedy these
things was impossible,

I held my peace & supposed that these were the evils which we are informed are inseparable from war -

But lately I have had the opportunity of hearing the opinions of officers who were the only beings like men whom I have seen since I came out & find that the remedies I should propose are not only feasible but actually carried out almost everywhere - & that

our Depot at Scutari is supposed to be the worst managed & our Commandant at Scutari acknowledged to be the worst officer in the service (It appears that he was asked for by Lord Rag/Stratford merely because he was a man of rank) If we had had a man like Major Fellowes, on Ld Raglan's Staff, or like Genl Jones, or like many others I could name, how different Scutari would have been!

The intoxication &
indiscipline of the
Barrack at Scutari
is what shocks, not
mere civilians like
ourselves, but old
Officers - I never knew
what *dead drunk*
meant till I saw
these wretched beings
brought into our Hospital
upon stretchers - But
all the redress we could
ever get from Ld W. Paulet
was "These are the
brutes you spoil" -

[end 14:184]

signed letter, 6ff, pen 2057/F4/66

Birk Hall
Ballater
Sept 28/56

[14:451-52]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Many thanks for
the enclosed which
is exactly what I
expected - If/As no
Establishment can,
for Military reasons,
which I understand,
be organized at
Aix La Chapelle or

elsewhere abroad,
I should question
the desirableness of
having a *permanent*
establishment at
Bath - I should
like to see the
experiment tried there,
which I have
proposed to Dr.
Pincoffs & Lord Panmure

with 60 Patients
for this year on
the terms which
I shewed to you -
But I think that
the upshot will be
that it will be found
better to concentrate
all our efforts towards
having a good sea=
bathing (warm) equip=

ment of ~~Baths~~/Douches &c at
the Southampton Mily
Hospital - as, for
external application
(which would be
all we should do
at Bath,) equally
efficacious - This is
a question however
for medical opinion
& not for me to
decide -

-2-

I had meant to
have written to you
this very day to
claim your very
important promise
to meet me, if you
were in London,
for "a combined
attack upon the
Bison". I have
found the Queen,
Prince Albert & Sir

George Grey propitious -
Yesterday however
the Queen came
here & pressed me
to remain ~~here~~ to
see Lord Panmure
(who comes on duty
here this week)
with reasons which
it would have
been foolish in me

to oppose - though
I would rather
have seen Lord
Panmure with you.
However the one
does not preclude
the other - And I
hope you will (like
a Cid) stand up
for the cause of the
poor oppressed Army

Hospitals which I
assure you have not
won ~~one~~ a step of
the ground yet by the
experience of the War -

I have progressed
so far as this that
the Queen has asked
me to write a plan
for Lord Panmure &
to send it to her -
She is interested -
the Prince is enlightened-
And both anxious to
do their best for reform.

-3-

The Prince's prediction for the Horse Guards is however alarming. How odd that they should not understand that the Chelsea Commission has really struck the severest blow at the prerogative of the Crown, because the country will never

trust the Executive again - The cleverest thing which ever was done by an Executive was the appointment of an honest Commission who did their work honestly & neutralized the effect of Roebuck's

Committee - Then Govt throws overboard its own Commission - & the country proclaims again (& this time with truth) that Ministers cannot be trusted to do their own work -

I think the return of the Regimental Officers

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
from the Crimea who
felt most keenly the
inconsistency of Chelsea
will exasperate this
feeling still more -

73

October 2012

I shall come to
London as soon as
I can, & see Fort Pitt
& our Home Military
Hospitals, & I hope,
yourself before I
finally assault ~~the~~/your
"Bison" - Yours ever gratefully
F. Nightingale

[end 14:452]

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St.
London

Oct 31/56

[14:461-62]

Dear Mr. Herbert

If you come to London
during the next fortnight,
will you have the
goodness to let me
know that you are
there? There are
many things for me
to refer to you -

Not at all connected
with these things, but
still a matter to be

referred to you is the
following. I have seen
a letter from one of my
"Council". I do not
remember the exact
words (for it was only
shewn to me) - But the
gist of it was that
I might go to Operas
& Races - no pledge
against amusing myself
existed/ing - but that I
might not take Govern=
ment employment -

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
being pledged to work
for Civil Hospitals - by
the Fund -

74

October 2012

I can never forget,
whatever others may,
for the reason that no
one knows as I do,
the *needless* sacrifice
of human life during
the late War from
causes not connected
with ~~the~~ War - nor
how the result of
governing a Hospital
by several Departments,

(of which the Officers
are appointed by
different authorities,)
is delay, inefficiency
& irresponsibility -

As you are the
person who at once
gave me Government
employment, & originated
the Civil Hospital Fund,
I should wish to
consult you, as you
have allowed me to
do throughout, as to
whether you consider

that the two things clash -
If you do,, - as I am
quite sure that, in the
events of another war,
which seems so near,
I should go, if Ministers
offered me the opportunity
as you did - and as
I am sure that, war
or no war, I never
can cease, while I live,
doing whatever falls in
my way in the work
I have mentioned above
viz. the Military Hospitals

which God & you so singularly put into my hands, - I would ask you whether you would ask "my Council", during this month of November, when no one has much to do, to determine this question.

I am provoked to have to bother about such a question now, when there are such much more important

ones - about which I would so much rather consult you -

Pray believe me

dear Mr. Herbert

Yours very truly & gratefully

Florence Nightingale

I have not answered your two kind letters.

But I should have much to tell you about my "*Pan*", could I see you -

[end]

unsigned note, undated, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

The Newcastle Case would make a very good illustrative case altogether, if we had the invaliding.

[15:274-75]

The outbreak of Yellow Fever in 1856 was exceptional - And it is of importance to ascertain the cause of the exception.

Lawson's pamphlet is a very good Analysis of the facts. He disposes effectually of the theory

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
of Contagion - and shews
the disease to have
been of *local* origin.
He does not however
account for it satis=
factorily.

Dr. Burrell, who
was at Newcastle for
some time, informs us,
in a long note on the
Pamphlet, "that Lawson's
"account of the disease
"is deficient - But,
"such as it is, it shews
"that the Epidemic

"was not the Yellow Fever
"of the plains but a very
"modified form of Fever
" - in some cases without
"the characteristics of
"Yellow Fever at all."

The effect of the
elevation & lower temper=
ature ~~being~~/were decided
in modifying the disease.

Dr. Burrell mentions
one or two important
illustrative facts on the
same side. From June
to November, 1843, the
60th Regt at Newcastle

had 60 cases of sharp
Fever - And the 77th Regt
at Maroon Town, also a
Hill Station, had 80 cases
- *without a single death*
(in either Regiment).

Dr. Burrell & Sir
W. Gomm attribute the
outbreak to what was
without doubt its
true cause - viz. neglect
of Sanitary precautions.

Dr. Burrell even goes
so far as to hint that,
in consequence of this
neglect, they ~~will~~/may be

obliged to take up
new ground -

The case, in fact is
the best proof of the
truth of what you said
in the Ho. of C., as cited
by Sir W. Gomm, viz.
that advantage of situation
is no security in tropical
climates where due
attention is not paid
to cleanliness & general
"conservancy" -

It shews the necessity
of establishing a Sanitary

Police throughout the
W. Indies & India -
in order that while
the one condition of health,
viz. a selection of proper
sites, is carried out,
the other, ~~of~~/viz. what the
Indians call "conservancy",
~~is~~/may not be neglected -

Dr. Burrell says "that
"Newcastle has been occupied
"from 15 to 20 years by a
"succession of Regiments" -
"that the sloping ground
"has been partially leveled,
"scooped out & disturbed
"from time to time". that,
"on the level spaces,
"impurities inseparable
"from a not very cleanly
"population have been
"allowed to accumulate" -
that "*soldiers neither*
know nor inquire into
the habits of former

"occupants" - that "old
"thatch & other decomposing
"matters have been thus
"allowed to accumulate" -
and that "the privies
"entered into cess-pits
"or into the ravines."

The practical point
of this obviously is,
that while the occupants
are constantly changing,
there should always be
a resident local
Sanitary Police.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

79

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St.
London W.

Jan 14/56 {archivist: 1857}

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have heard nothing of my Master, except through Lord Palmerston, to whom, it seems, the former had communicated certain things that he & I - and you & I have talked about.

I conceive that he is purposely, - not, as you good naturedly put it, from press of business, putting off your "Commission" -

I have had only a note from him, saying that he wishes to see me when he comes to town -

In answer to your question concerning McLachlan & Alexander, the former, though an able man, is nothing to your purpose. Without the latter, I believe you will do nothing - And Dr. Smith is, I am told, rejoicing at the prospect of this issue of the Commission - Lord Panmure has done nothing yet that I know of about sending for him (Dr. Alexander)

I send you some rough notes of mine upon these points, which please return if you have not time to read -

The upshot of them is this

(I shall not put them in
bodily into my Precis)

The Duke of Newcastle
was told there were wants
in the Crimea, & being a
feeling man, he was much
shocked, made that speech
saying how much he was
interested & that he had
sons out there, & finally,
went ~~out~~ to enquire for
himself in the Crimea -
Now there was no occasion
for him to go to the East
to enquire - he might simply
have sent to St. James's
Place, & asked Dr. Andrew
Smith 'what supplies
have you sent out?' Roe-
buck's Committee did ask,

& Dr. Andrew Smith furnished
them with a "Return" -

Roebuck's Committee
did nothing that I know
of except furnish people
with breakfast=table
conversation - But, if the
Duke of Newcastle who is
so conscientious, or Mr.
Roebuck who is so sharp,
had simply looked over
that List which Dr. Smith
put in, they would have
seen that the Hospital
Supplies, sent out for the
whole 8 months terminating
Dec/54, would last 2000
sick just 3 weeks -
whereas it is but too well
known that our sick in

August, September, October,
were 11,000, in November,
16,000, in December 19,000.
Yet Dr. Smith expresses
amazement that he cannot
imagine where all his
supplies are gone to.

The Duke of Newcastle
was ~~(illeg)~~/told he must "go out".
& he went "out", hardly I
dare say knowing why
to this day. If he had
simply brought forward
that "Return" as a reason
why Dr. Andrew Smith must
go out, & he ~~was~~ be justified,
perhaps that alone might
have saved him.

And *what must* Dr.
Smith think? For I suppose

he knows what that "Return"
means. He must think
how well he calculated,
after all, for you are *out*
& he is *in* -

And Roebuck behaves to him
like a bear & all is said
& done -

In the same way, people
look at the "return" of
washing (say) done at
Scutari & they see 3000
pieces washed per month,
& they think that is a
good many - They are
incapable of the arithmetic
that where, there is an
ever-changing population
~~of~~/averaging 2000 Patients, that makes

1-1/2 pieces per month (per man & not the same man.) & a pair of socks is 2 pieces.

The farce of all our Commissions, Committees, our House of Commons, is this. Our people rising up en masse & turning out the two men who had not done the mischief - & then rising up the second time, when all those who *had* done the mischief were rewarded, & Lord Panmure satisfying them with saying "I am very sorry, but I did not know these men had been promoted," & Lord Hardinge saying, "I am very sorry, I did know there had been sufferings in the Crimea,

but I did not know these men had done it" -

Has all this clamour got us one single thing altered, excepting the one organic change the D. of Cambridge has made, viz educating for the Staff?

When I give my Precis to Lord Panmure, he will shew it to Andrew Smith, & A. Smith will say, "Oh the Regimental Surgeons have told her this," and I shall say, "No, Dr. Smith told me himself" - But no one will hear -

I have taken one instance only, because it was the want of "Hospital comforts" which made *most* "row". But there are many.

{from the bottom of f3}
Believe me faithfully yrs

F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

83

October 2012

PRIVATE 30 Old Burlington St **[16:245-46]**
 London W.
 Jan 16/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

I think, as my
professional foster-mother,
(a curious position, by the
way for you to stand in
towards me,) it is my duty
to inform you that the
Director General of the
Navy Medical Department
is making serious proposals
to me viz. to occupy
the position of fulfilling
the same duties in the
Naval Hospitals at home

which you assigned me
in the War Hospitals.
Sir John Liddell is to take
me down to Haslar almost
immediately - I will
confess to you that, if I
accept, it will be mainly
because I think it will
shame the Army Hospitals
into doing what they
require so much more -
I cannot forget my first
love, nor marry another
Department again so soon.
I was shocked &
scandalized by the Woolwich

Artillery Hospital when I visited it with General Williams, & longed to be "at it". Lord Palmerston even spoke of giving me (when I saw him) a permanent Commission to visit & inspect the Woolwich & Aldershot Hospitals. But I have heard nothing of it since.

I should consider it by no means breaking but entering into, the spirit of the kind of engagement I am under to your Fund, to

include the Naval & Military Female Nursing in my work - But I will not enter into any engagement without consulting you.

I will only ask you to mention this to *no one* for 2 reasons - Sir J. Liddell is, for obvious causes, anxious to keep it all quiet till all is settled - 2. Mr. Bracebridge & I are almost as wide apart in our courses as Sir J. McNeill & Col. Tulloch. He wishes me to liberate

my soul, as he calls it,
say as many disagreeable
things i.e. as I can, &
then have nothing to do
ever with Government again.
I, on the other hand, mean
to stick to the Army
Hospitals as long as I
live, & do not see ~~what~~
at all how I liberate my
soul with regard to them
by "speaking my mind"
so that it would eject
myself, even if that mind
were a true one -

Please to be so good as

to return me those notes
of mine I troubled you
with, as I have no copy.
It does not signify
about your reading
them, as I could tell
it you all in ½ an hour,
if you have "Your Commission".

[end 16:246]

ever faithfully yrs

F. Nightingale

I learn that the Duke of
Cambridge contemplates
having Soldiers' Wives as
Nurses at Netley Hospital.

[15:148-49]

And Lord Palmerston told me he saw no objection to the plan - It is very unlikely that he should - But, as the D. of Cambridge has chosen to be Chairman at a Meeting for improving the *status* of Female Nurses, & as the Duchess of Gloucester told me, when she sent for me, that "George" wished to see me, I shall consult you on the most appropriate method of my informing "George's" mind upon the subject. F.N.

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St.
W.

Jan 19/57

[14:476-77]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Thank you very much for your letter & for your hint (most valuable) with regard to using the scissors instead of the pen - The history of my not doing so is curious enough to tell you - When I was in the East, most of the Blue Books pertaining to the War used to be sent out to me - I never read those, or the Newspapers,

or any other papers. Sir John Hall asked me for my copy of Maxwell's Commission which I lent him & which he did not return to me for upwards of a year, viz. when we evacuated the Crimea when I asked him for it. When he returned it to me, ~~he~~ ~~had~~ several pages were cut out. I, never having read it, knew not what they

were, & innocently set to work, with the mutilated copy, when I returned to England. I thought there was so little to my purpose that a very little copying would do - especially as Maxwell had, I knew, so cut down the *Scutari* evidence that I reproached him with it on the spot & he answered "What would you have me do? I have a wife & 8 children"

However, I sent for another copy, & then I found that what Hall had cut out was the whole of *Alexander's* evidence, & indeed all the most valuable part. I ~~sent~~ sat or copied gradually thro', instead of doing what I ought to have done, viz. deciding at once on all I should want. But I took it, as I have said, really "at random" -

I know, from Dr. Hall

himself that he believed
my copy to be the only
one in the Crimea - &
the only other one I am
aware of was not, I
know, accessible to him.
I have reason to believe
that he made use of
the mutilated copy with
those in Command - &
was not detected -

I am glad you do not
like Lefroy's plan of
Army Education - The
Engineers are very
angry about it.

Col. Lefroy is a really
high-minded man - and
as we had not much of
that growth in the Crimea,
I clung to him, in the
prospect of another
campaign, ~~like in illeg}~~
to do our business with
Lord Panmure - which he
did. But he has a
singular incapacity of
distinguishing true
evidence from false,
& if he thinks a man
"ill-used", that man is
always sure to be a knave.
Still he has a curious

influence over Lord Panmure,
& the only man I ever
knew the noble Lord to
have any consideration for
is Col. Lefroy. He is,
however, very unfit to
have charge of educating
us -

The D. of Cambridge's
principle seems to be
nomination, not selection,
in the Staff Education -
whereas what has been
found to answer so well
in that noble little Army,
the Sardinian, is selection by
~~after~~ examination -
But I suppose that, as

long as a Regiment
belongs to the Officer
& not to the Officer to the
Regiment, we can
never have anything
like the Sardinian -

I am going down to
Haslar tomorrow
morning with Sir John
Liddell - When I have
done my Precis, I shall
write no more - I will
work for Lord Panmure,
or, if he won't have
me, for somebody else.

But I will write no
more for him. My
time is short, & I
should like to do what
work I can while I
am here - the pen & ink
service I don't call
one -

[end]

I am sorry that
Mrs. Herbert is so
troublesome. Tell her
from me that life
is too valuable,
especially hers, to throw
away upon what is
not necessary.

yrs faithfully
F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Jany 1957 on the mutilated Scutari
Evidence & Col Lefroy's system of Army Education}

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand: 10 Feb/57 Miss F.N. Airey's
Evidence - Army Mortality compared with Navy or Civilians - Ld Panmure's
trickiness} 2057/F4/66

22 Albemarle St
W. Feb 10/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

I send you the Résumé
of Genl Airey's evidence,
with the References,
which I said I would
look out - Please return
me the paper.

I consider Panmure
quite as hopeless as you
do, as Mrs. Herbert will
tell you - And the more
civil, the more hopeless.

I had always understood
that his way was not to

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
compromise himself in
writing, but to approve
or propose verbally, &
then say, "what proof
have you to shew?"

91

October 2012

He has played this
game now - To all
Sanitary proposals, he
& Lord Palmerston have
always answered
"Sutherland is to be made
the Civil & Sanitary
adjunct to And. Smith."
This, at least, they cannot
say that *I* proposed.
Dr. Sutherland is now
going to take other
employment, as he will not

~~employment~~/wait any longer - Lord Panmure

He ordered (verbally)
Sutherland & myself to
make Sanitary reports
to him upon the Hospitals
of Southton, Woolwich,
Aldershot & Portsmouth.
And when, mindful of
the above & sensible
that he would give no
effect to any Report
we might make, I
sent Dr. Sutherland to
him to ask for an
authority to obtain
official Returns, he
said he knew the
Hospitals were bad &

therefore!

did not wish anything
farther to be done -

The fact is that he did
not wish us to see the
Returns - I have *some*,
which shew that the
Mortality in the Guards
at home is 20 per 1000
Artillery 19 per 1000
Line 16 " "
being nearly double that
of the Navy on home
stations. It might be
brought down to 8 or 10
per (~~illeg~~)/1000. The Sanitary
state of our Army at
home is worse than
that of the worst parts
of London -

faithfully yours

F. Nightingale

signed letter, undated 2ff, pen {in another hand: Feb/57 Miss F.N. (two
Notes) Commission ought not to be delayed for Dr. Alexander, tho' his
presence essential - indignant at delay - and at Ld Panmure's "healthy
state of the army" 2057/F4/66

Dear Mr. Herbert

[14:492-93]

I have written you
the enclosed formal note
& should be really glad
that you should make
use of it.

I know you cannot
come to me today, because
of the Estimates, but I
will either wait for you
or come to you tomorrow -
which ever is least
inconvenient to you

All that Lord Panmure

has hitherto done (and
it is just six months
since I came home)
has been to gain time -
And this Commission,
I hold it, granting it only
as he does now, is also
merely to gain time -

He has broken his
most solemn promises
to Dr. Sutherland, to me
& to the Crimean Commission.

And, on three months
from this day, I publish
my experience of the
Crimean Campaign & my

suggestions for improvement,
unless there has been a
fair & tangible pledge
by that time for Reform.
I do not hold this out
as a threat, which
would be unworthy of
my cause; But I hold
it a plain duty to go
on - And I have a
higher Master than my
daily task=master at
the War Department to serve.
It does not appear, either,
that any one will go on
with the cause, if I do not.

I conceive that, if you knew as I do, the promises made by Lord Panmure, you would declare as I do the delay during the recess to be *scandalous* - The men are sacrificed, as usual, to the Officers & the "Department". What Lord Panmure calls the "healthy state of his Army" I should call the *unhealthy* state of our Army. I would not head the Commission, if I were you, without a fair pledge from him that the Report shall be acted upon - faithfully yrs if approved F. Nightingale

[end 14:493]

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St.
W.

[14:493-94]

Feb 13/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

I am truly glad that, at last, there is some prospect of an advance being made - The time which has been lost is much to be regretted, for there are many points connected with the Commission, which would have been better arranged during the recess than ~~in~~amid the multiplicity of

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
subjects afforded by the
Parliamentary Session -

95

October 2012

I accept the promised
recall of Dr. Alexander
to serve, & also the
promise given by Lord
Panmure as to the
arrangements being
entered upon for the
Commission, merely as
an earnest of progress.
The latter, however,
should in no degree
be made dependent

on the former. The
organization & preliminary
work of the Commission
will absorb so
considerable a period
of time that to delay,
till Dr. Alexander can
return from Canada,
will be virtually to
sacrifice the whole
~~period~~ interval, I
must, therefore, press
for the preliminary
work being begun

without delay, & Dr.
Alexander can take his
place on the Commission
whenever it is ready
to begin its duties -
The sooner he returns
the better, for the real
work of enquiry cannot
go on without him but
his absence can be no
reason why the Commission
should not be issued
& organized -

[end 14:494]

faithfully yours

Florence Nightingale

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: Feby 27.(57 2057/F4/66

22 Albemarle St. W.

Feb 27/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

All your men (save
one) are for going on - in
re "Commission" - So, God
be with you -

F. Nightingale

I am bound to add that
every one of these men gave
as his reason for "going
on" this & this only - that
it would be placing a
mass of information in
the hands of Lord Panmure's

successor - but that, as
far as the present
S. of S. for War went,
there could be but one
conclusion viz, that
any faithful Report
would meet with the
fate of that of the
Crimean Commission -

To retail this opinion
farther would be
unfair to the men -

F.N.

30 Old Burln St.
London

Good Friday {Apr 10 [1857]}

[16:248]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have had your
letter of the 31st, and
you have had by this
time Sutherland's
of the 1st, asking
your orders about
serving on the *new*
Netley Commission -

I think what you
think is probably the
best - viz. to let
them have their
wicked way - and
to fight the thing
in the Ho. of Commons
& before the public.

I have seen Galton
who allows (a wonderful
admission for a R.E.)
that Laffan knows
nothing about Sanitary
Construction -

[end 16:248]

2. Having seen a
second time in the
"Times" since your

[14:501]

departure that the
Indian invalids were
to be *hulk*=ed, I
wrote to Sir J. Liddell,
and enclose his answer.
You will observe
that the thing has
been considered - that
the order is only
suspended, not
rescinded - so that
I suppose it might
take place any time.

3. Soyer is to give
a plan for 140 men's

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
cooking in Wellington
Barracks -

98

October 2012

I hope you are better
& not changing your
plans for your health's
sake -

Believe me
ever faithfully yours
F. Nightingale

The "Guards" have got out
an eminently silly pamph-
let against your Commission,
~~called~~ as to the "Causes" of their Mortality,
laying it upon *their own*
misconduct - It admits of
an easy answer.

[end 14:501]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

99

October 2012

signed letter, 6ff, pen {in another hand: Miss N. April 1857 Alexander
come. revision of Intentions for Commissions} 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St. W.

April 25/57

[14:504-06]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I was very sorry to
hear from Lady Dunmore
that you had been ill,
but I trust that you
are now quite recovered,
& that Mrs. Herbert is
pretty well. Your election
was a miserable shame,
but, thank God! it is won.

This is only to inform you
that the Commission, of
which you have consented

to be Head, is to be out
in a few days - The
Instructions have been
sent to a lawyer to
"rédiger" - And I have
this morning entered
my protest at the W.O.
against their being
finally settled without
being submitted to you -
- as well as the names
on the Commission - I
saw it written down then & there,
in pencil that it was
to be so - But such is

my experience of these
gentry that I "fear even
their gifts" - And thought
it better to premonish
you - You will know
best how to be on
your guard -

I see a great deal
to be done by this
Commission - I see the
ground is occupied by you
alone - The country has
great faith in the Duke
of Newcastle's conscien=
tiousness - none on his
administrative power -

Lord Grey's temper &
Lord Dalhousie's health
close the career to them.

From several speeches
you have made in the
Ho. of C., you have assumed
~~occupied~~ & still occupy
in the opinion of the country,
the solitary position of
Reformer of the Army -
God knows there is
enough to reform! - You
perhaps read Dr. Letheby's
report in the "Times" on the
sanitary & moral state
of one of the Lanes in the
City. I believe not a

-2-

newspaper in England but
{illeg}/has had its leading
Article upon it. I
thought to myself, "My
dear friends, reserve your
consternation! At this
moment, in H.M.'S
Barracks at Brompton,
(as I saw the last time
I went there), 9 women,
9 men, & 23 children
are/~~were~~ living promiscuously
in one casemate with
only a window on each
side the door!"

Now John Bull knows
nothing of this. His deep
feeling, in the large

manufacturing towns,
about what he does
know, viz. Sir J. McNeill's
& Col. Tulloch's Report,
remains unabated -

If a man had no
higher motive than that
of making a reputation,
let him, with accuracy
of facts, knowledge of his
subject, & feeling for his
subject, really state
a good case on the
present Moral & Sanitary
State of the Army *at home*
in the Ho. of Commons, &
he will find the House

with him, & ready to
vote any Estimates -

Panmure is incapable
of doing this or of organizing
anything - But you
might have it all
your own way - if you
chose - the facts are ready to
your hand -

The House is zealously
anxious to do *something*-
it does not know what.

Dr. Alexander is in
England - I have seen him
two or three times. He
is full of moral energy
& directness of purpose.
He knows what he wants

& will go straight at it,
without any disguise -

Had he been at the head
of Medical things in the
Crimea, we should have
had no Limejuice lying
unused at Balaclava,
while the men were perishing,
nor Quinine left at
Scutari when there was
none at B'clava - in time
of Fever.

I have just had a
note from Panmure to
say that the Draft
Instructions go to you today,
& that he will bring
them himself to me on
Monday - *PRAY* write [und 4 times]

to me *by return of post*,
& tell me what you
mean to say to Panmure,
& what I am to say to
him, that we may be
in the same story.

It struck me, on
re-reading your letter
to him (for which I
acknowledge myself
responsible) & comparing
what we had asked for
with the dreadful state
of the Army *at home*
that something more
comprehensive (like
this) should be added

"To enquire into and
report on the operation
of the regulations in force
respecting the adminis=
tration,, Medical attendance
& supplies of Army
Hospitals & *into the*
regulations in force for
securing the health of
the Army, both at
home & abroad, and
into all matters
referring thereto."

I doubt whether your
letter covers the entire

ground - whether, e.g.
Barrack accommodation,
Rations, Condition of
the Wives could come in -
(as it at present stands)
among the matters to
be looked into by the
Commission - Yet
these things are far
more important than
the Hospital system
to the ~~stre~~ health &
moral state of our
Army - And no one
can look at the
physical construction
of the children in the
Royal Military Asylum,

without seeing what a
race we are producing
by our criminal neglect
in such things as I have
mentioned, as occurring
at this Moment at
Chatham - For these
things, there is *no*
excuse at *home* -

If you have "Life of
Genl Sir Charles Napier",
please read P.P. 252, 253,
Vol I

Pray believe me
most sincerely yours
(tho' a "turbulent fellow")
F. Nightingale

[end 14:506]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/66

105

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St.

W.

April 27/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

Lord Panmure is
just gone - He consents
to all your additions -
& to the additions which
you will see added in
pencil on your M.S.-
Note I. "adding to" ~~will~~/would not
have included *Statistics*, as
one less sadly versed
in the A.M.D. than I
am, would naturally
conclude it did - Dr. A. Smith
would not allow that

Statistics formed a part
of "professional knowledge",
tho' you & I should.
Besides, these men know
only the *Statistics* that
they themselves give -
You could not call
the evidence of Tulloch,
Balfour or Farr upon
anything/authority in this ~~form?~~ Commn
I have therefore added
the two clauses, which
Lord Panmure has
approved, & which
I hope will make
sure of our "*Statistics*"

He would not admit the corrections in Note II, viz - "hospitals", "canteens", "accommodation for families of married soldiers".

I was in hopes & he was in fear that it would bring in the whole question of "wives" -

Are you coming up to town for the 30th. The final \pounds form goes in to the Queen for signature on Friday week - But it has first to go to Andrew Smith & then to be

engrossed or whatever you call it - And P., ~~he~~ has refused, which I entreated, to let it go to you at Wilton for final approbation first. However, he sends me one tomorrow - And I shall send it to you, unless you will be up on the 30th - as I should like one more struggle for "wives" & "canteens" -

Your men are a good working Commission & far better than anything I expected - in great haste
very faithfully yrs F. Nightingale

I think your corrections covered all the ground except the Statistics-

P. says that some of the opinions of the Commission may be carried out before the whole Report is ready. And he calls upon you to prepare your course of taking up subjects. I have made a sketch, which may be of some use to you -

{in another hand: 27 Apr/57 Miss Nightingale Ld Panmure Dr. A. Smith
Statistics wives & Canteens The Commission

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: May/57 Miss Nightingale
Commission - Warrant - Ld Panmure} 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St.

[14:506]

May 1/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

With regard to your "Commission", I have just heard that my

"alterations" (which I shewed you) "are introduced "except that relating to "the treatment & 'prevention "'of disease'" Lord Panmure says that "these words "are unnecessary, as "'professional education' "must include the "cure & 'prevention of

"disease" - This is just
what it does not do -
neither in Civil nor
in Military medical
life - And the whole
frightful catastrophe
of the War=Hospitals
is one continued
illustration of the fact.

I keep the note,
because it is important,
in that it is Lord Panmure's
own interpretation of his
Instructions. And I
have no fear but that
you will stretch them

to cover this - It shews,
however, in what
complete ignorance he
sent out his own Sanitary
Commn, & his act is in
opposition to his fact(?)

The Queen *has* now
signed the Warrant -
& therefore the "Commission"
has now nothing to do
but to sit.

I saw Dr. Alexander
immediately after you
yesterday - & set him
to work to "index" his
subjects - I am doing
the same - So is Sutherland.

We shall all be ready by
Tuesday - I think Sir T.
Phillips ought then to
see us in your presence.

Sir J. McNeill is anxious
to see you upon this matter
& is coming up to town -
He thinks he does not
know you - Might I bring
him to your appointment?

I believe T. Baring is
not to have Mr. Peel's [?]
place - But Sir John Rams-
den, a mere boy.

Lord Palmerston appears
anxious to do the Army
Estimates himself -

[end 14:506]

ever yours faithfully
F. Nightingale

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: 13 May/57 Miss Nightingale
"Governing Bodies of Royal Colleges"} 2057/F4/66

May 13/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

You are quite at
liberty to quote from
the "Governing Bodies
of Royal Colleges", which
I left with you last
night -

Yours ever faithfully
F. Nightingale

Dear Mr. Herbert

[14:508-09]

I have read the enclosed twice through attentively & made no marks, which if I had, they would have been strong ones.

For once, the Medical & Purveying Depts are "d'accord" - The ideas of the former on Army Medical Reform are
more pay
more relative rank
more funeral honors
less work

The ideas of the Purveying Dept on Purveying Reform are
more pay
more relative rank
less work

It is truly Homeric.

But it is curious how these Purveyors entirely ignore, at least in these notes, the ~~care~~ /interest of the *Sick*, viz. that which they are there for. It is Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out - I see my old friend of Jersey lifting up his head again, & graciously bestowing his approbation. while Purvr Jenner, the man who *best*

did his duty in the War,
is not there at all -

But what is really
distressing & not at all
a joke is this -

Most of these men
I have served with in
the war. I know that
they know the evils, from
which followed the loss
of an Army, as well as
I do. Yet there is not
one who has habits of
business, or organizing
power, or clearness of
perception, or of feeling
enough to ~~(illeg)~~/see other than
what is noted in this
Paper - The only sensible

suggestion in it is that
against contracts & this is negatived by Purv. in Chief. This
Paper is in itself the
strongest condemnation
of the whole Department I
have seen -

I am very glad ~~to~~/you have
seen it. before examining.
2. I am sorry, ~~that~~/but not
surprised, that "my
Pratt" was not confidential.
However, four of your men
whom I have seen,
unite in saying that
he made such a
break-down, or rather
Exposé, as to condemn
the system, root & branch.
My Pratt is a treasure.

And I was quite satisfied with his evidence - I am much more afraid of Robertson, who is a clever fellow - & a plausible - for making the worse appear the better cause -

3. I am glad you have seen the Naval & Military Hospitals - Upon them, I must remark that the Naval are entirely furnished & supplied by the AGENT, *without* Barrack, Ordnance or Commisst Dept. I think

{in another hand: May/57 - Miss Nightingale - Remarks on Medical & Purveying Departments}

however there might be improvements in the two Depts corresponding to our Commandts & Engineers

In the E. Indian Service, the Steward does every thing which I propose he should do - excepting that he is the servant of the Commisst & not of the Governor - Were our Commisst on the same model & with the same military organization as theirs, it might do - But never as ours is now constituted -

I send you Sir J. McNeill's criticisms upon me, which please return.

Should you ~~want~~/wish to see me before Friday, I could come any time except 4 o'clock on Thursday.

[end 14:509]

ever faithfully yrs

F. Nightingale

May 20/57

initialed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

July 15/57

[14:526-27]

I return the Draft Report, because I am sure it must be wanted - I agree & more than agree with it. At the same time, I should like to go over the whole some day much more carefully, as I might be able to suggest some things which might be of use to Mr. Herbert.

Now, however, would you tell him this? viz.

I want the "Report" of

the Army Medical Dept on the Statistics of the War They have been at work at it for 6 months. Lord Panmure told me himself that it was ready but told me, the great oaf!, that he had ordered Andrew Smith "NOT to bring him into trouble by it, as Tulloch had done."

I was told today by a man who had heard Andrew Smith say it this morning himself in the Office - "that the

first part was out-"
that "he had forbidden
the printing of more
than 25 copies" - that
"Lord Panmure & the
Duke of Cambridge
were to have two" -
& that "nobody else
was to see them" but
"he, Andrew Smith, was
to keep them all
under lock & key" -

Now, it is of the
utmost importance
to us to have one
now - because, they

are keeping it back, in
order to have the last
word, after Mr. Herbert's
Report is out - which
Andrew Smith says
"he will never sign!"
or, "if he does, he will
fill any Board which
Mr. Herbert can compose,
Sanitary & Statistical,
with his, A. Smith's
own men" -

If Mr. Herbert could
get me this Report,
it would be of ~~so~~
much use - now -

ever dearest yours
F.N.

[end 14:527]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 5ff, pen 2057/F4/66

115

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St.
London W.

Aug 8/57

[14:527-29]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I enclose Sir J. Clark's
scheme for a Military Medical
School. It has been seen
by Dr. Sutherland & Mr.
Martin. And they approve
of the pencil modifications.

The whole point,
however, is lost by this
scheme, which is: if
you are to improve the
Army Medical Dept, the
means of improvement
are not to be dictated
by themselves, any more

than by any other uneducated
class - *Independence* of the
"Director-General", (at least
of any D.G. you are likely
to have for the next
20 years,) would constitute
the main claim to
public confidence, the
main means of usefulness
of this School - It ought,
therefore, to depend immediately
on the S. of S., or, if an
Army Educational Board
be constituted, on this
Board.

There are many
precedents in Government
to this -

(It is positively incredible that the young men should have been, up to this time, put under any chance Inspector at Fort Pitt to be educated).

Till the Army Medical Board is educated, it is no use putting the education under it -

Dr. Sutherland has seen the enclosed Draft, which I have made for your approval, & he approves - Should you take this view,

you might either propose it direct to Panmure, who would, otherwise, be left in the hands of Andrew Smith - or call a Sub=Commission of say Dr. Parkes
Sir B. Brodie
Mr. Ferguson,
with yourself at its head, & call upon them to consult with you upon some such scheme for Panmure. It might perhaps come with more force from a lay Authority i.e. under you -

2. The Barrack Commission progresses thus: Dr. Sutherland, having consulted Capt. Laffan, by Lord Panmure's direction, as to a competent Royal Engineer, Capt. Laffan admitted that he had none to recommend - What an admission - that, altho' we had Engineers to build Barracks to kill the men, we had none to cure them - Sutherland has accordingly

written to Panmure asking for a Civil Engineer, besides the Military one, whom Capt. Laffan proposes should be Capt. Galton, Board of Trade, (i.e. for London alone) - and for Dr. Burrell as the only Medical Officer he knows who is Sanitary also -

This complication will make it still more impossible to work, unless you are at the head to decide differences -

Col. Jebb went out of town yesterday. He came to see me, & said he knew of no R. Engineer.

I thought much of what you said as to the necessity of educating the present Army Inspectors for Sanitary Inspection - a vague hint, but too vague was given for it, in the sketch of organization of Army Medical Board. The only practical plan would seem to be to educate them in

connection with the Barrack-Commission Inspections - And I know no man but Sutherland capable of doing it. If Panmure would connect with this Itinerant Commission some such plan as I venture to enclose, *it* would do it.

3. I have looked thro' the Q.M.G.'s Regulations & made notes upon them for you - They are really incredible -

The *Model* Camp gives 248,000 men to

the square mile - The
lowest is 150,000 - The
inhabited area for Camps gives 800,000
men to the square mile!!!!

Now LONDON is 50,000 only. [triple und]

[end 14:529]

ever sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 8 Aug. 1857 Miss Nightingale on the constitution of the
Army Medical Board & Army Medical School}

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Aug/57 Miss F.N. The P.M.O. a
mistake - won't do to place the Sanitary officer in the Field under him}
2057/F4/66

Dear Mr. Herbert

1. If you have the
Monthly Musters, could
you send them to me?

2. If it would be
more convenient to you
to see me after 5 o'clock,
it would be better for
me, because I want to
do these things with Farr.
And I would come to you,
any time after that that
you are not going for
a ride.

3. The more I think

about placing the Sanitary
Officer in the field *under*
the P.M.O. the more I
feel sure it will not
work - Because the two
have nothing in common.
The P.M.O. will report
to your newly created
Medical head - the
Sanitary Officer to your
Sanitary head - The
P.M.O. is really a
mistake. He performs
1. Inspections which
are of no use - because
they are upon things
in which the Regimental

Surgeon is far more interested & has more knowledge than he has
2. he collects bad Statistics -
3. he bungles the supplies of medicine.
These are his occupations & he has nothing to do with the Sanitary Officer -
ever sincerely yours
F.N.

Aug 13/57

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

Burln St.

Aug 15/57

[14:530]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dr. Sutherland has written to you - It appears to me that, with such ideas as Lord Panmure has, about the ~~esse~~ "financial limit" of the Barrack Commission, you should hardly allow yourself to be put at their head, as they can only fail in their

object of doing good to the men & disgrace themselves -

Upon a rough calculation I have made, founded upon other building works of a Sanitary kind, I should think 2s/2d per man *per annum* a fair calculation, i.e. a half penny *per week* per man, as the interest of the money laid out. I should not be at all surprised, if the improvements of the Six

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
London Barracks cost
£10,000, instead of
£600, according to Pan.

121

October 2012

But, if your Report
does not bring about
an expenditure like
this, I think Pan is
reckoning without his
host.

I cannot see how an
estimate can be made
per *Barrack* - it
must be per *man* -
(done in this rough
way without having
seen the Barracks) -

2. Dr. Balfour brought
me the "Recommendations"
today. He has made
a material alteration, as to Statistics,
utterly inadmissible, &
which strikes at the
vital element of
Statistics, which is
uniformity - I send

1. the original substance of the Report,
2. Balfour's alterations &
some emendations, signed

F.N.

[end 14:530]

between Brackets, which
I did not suggest to *him*,
tho' I contended the point
with him. but, without
which, I think nothing is gain{ed}

Balfour's Alterations

We recommend that a Nominal List of the deceased soldiers & of the births & marriages in the Army be communicated to the Registrar General [in the forms of the Schedules appended to the Registration Acts - (F.N.)] at such periods & in such a shape as may be necessary for the object in view.

That an improved nomenclature of diseases be adopted in the Army

Medical Returns, & such alteration in the classification of diseases as may admit of an accurate [& ready F.N.] comparison with [the National &

F.N.]
other returns of a similar nature, & that the periodical publication of the Statistics of Sickness & mortality among the troops be regularly organized.

[one great object of Army Statistical Returns is to shew to men of science & the public the peculiar diseases from which the Army suffers; & this will be accomplished most effectually by adopting the same classification

as is employed in returning the causes of Death in the civil Population. F.N.]

Substance[?] of Original Report

We recommend that the statistics of the mortality of the Army be kept with the same nomenclature & forms, as used by the Registrar-General, & that, ~~during~~ together with a nominal list of the deceased soldiers, they be communicated to the Registrar-General for publication, at such periods & in such a shape as may be necessary for the object in view -

{at top of preceding f, written sideways}
in great haste
ever faithfully yours

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Aug 15/57 Miss Nightingale - Objects to the small sum proposed to be spent on the Barracks - also to a change in the "Recommendations" by Dr. Balfour.}

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St
London W.
Aug 17/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have always forgotten to say, - would you not, (after comparing individual trades, as you do, (P. 6, Rept) with the Army in rates of Mortality,) compare the *whole* rate of Mortality of the *General* Population with that of the Army, which is drawn from thence?

Something like the

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
enclosed seems to be
necessary, done in your
own clear & terse way.

124

October 2012

The data are taken
from Farr's in the
Appendix - and, it
strikes me, the case is
inconclusive without
some such summing up
& comparison with
the whole Population,
from which the Army
is taken -

I am afraid this

is too late for the Report.
But it might come
into the final Report.

People have more
faith in the Registrar=
General than in Neison.

2. I have got the
Returns of Receipt &
Expenditure from the
Guards' Model Lodging
House - It brings in
about 2.2 per cent.
I think we shall be
able to make out a
very clear case, both

as to economy & morality,
for Lodging Houses for
the Line - Government
does, you know, already
give lodging=money, -
2d per day per woman
allowed to marry & to
live out of Barracks.

in haste

ever faithfully yours

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 17th Aug/57 Miss F.N. - compare *whole* rate of army
mortality with that of general Population - Guards' model Lodging House}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66 125
initialed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/66

October 2012

PRIVATE 30 Burl St
Aug 20/19/57

[14:531-32]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have accidentally
found among Dr. Balfour's
papers the very data
we have been asking
for for 3 months. And
I send you a Table
I have compiled, shewing
the Mortality for 5
years among Invalids
~~of~~/during the first 12 months
after invaliding -

It makes such an
important difference
in the Mortality of the

Army that it is
impossible to leave
out in your Report
a more detailed mention
of it.

I venture to send
some conclusions for
your *private* consideration.

To have kept back
these data shews either
utter ignorance of the
importance of their bearing
~~of them~~, or a wilful
intention to keep back
the truth -

Till I get the *Total*

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Strength & Mortality
of the Army, which
the Adjutant General
has equally promised
these 3 months, I cannot
calculate the addition
which this Table will
give to the whole Rate
of Mortality - But,
as soon as I can,
you shall have it.

It cannot be left
to the Appendix -

Whenever I am
infuriated, I revenge
myself with a new
Diagram & Dr. Farr,

in whose hands I have
placed a Copy of this
Table, & who is
constructing a very
pleasing "Curve" -

2. Dr. Balfour is
strenuous against the
Sub=Commissions on
Regulations & Statistics.
The fact is, the best of
these men want to
keep Regulations &
Statistics to themselves,
& they do not see that,
unless you are there
to do battle with A.
Smith & Panmure,
nothing good will be done.
Dr. Balfour wants it to be left to the
Army Medical Council.

Dr. Balfour is going to tell Lord Panmure that he disapproves of the Sub=Commissions. It is incredible how these men will stick to abuses & kick against the pricks.

3. Many thanks for your letter - I thought the Sub=Commissions very satisfactory - The clause about the "necessary things for all Barracks" will neutralize the harm of the £100 - The clause about the Statistics the harm of the alteration in the Recommendations F.N. **[end 14:532]**

{in another hand: Aug 19. 1857 Miss Nightingale - With Table shewing the Mortality among the Invalids}

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: ~~July~~ Sept 8./57 Miss F.N. - To stop Dr. Alexander's going to Malta.) 2057/F4/66

Great Malvern

Sept 8/57

[14:535]

Dear Mr. Herbert

This is only to say that I had a note from Mr. Alexander, dated Sept 2, which only arrived this morning saying:

"On the 10th inst., according to order from Dr. Smith, I am to write to him, applying for my passage to Malta."

You will judge

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
better than I, whether
there is anything to be
done -

128

October 2012

I don't well see how
the Commission are
to get on without
Alexander - He is not
a genius. But he is
pretty nearly the
honestest man I know,
& the only honest man
in the Department -

Perhaps he has
written to you -

Don't trouble to

answer this to me -

Should you have
occasion to write to
Alexander, I fancy

Preston Pans

Edinburgh

the most likely to find
him -

[end]

Yours very sincerely

F. Nightingale

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Sept/57 Miss F.N. - value of the
Sanitary Papers of the Army in the East} 2057/F4/66

Great Malvern

Sept 20/57

[14:535-36]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I will take your
advice & not come up
to town tomorrow. But,
as I must be there
soon on business, I hope
you will be so good as
to tell me when you
return from Wilton to
do "Pan", because I want
to bother you a little
more & come too -

I have gone through

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
all the Sanitary Letters
& Papers of the Army
in the East - I have
Dr. Sutherland down
here now, helping me.
Of course he will come
up whenever you
want him -

129

October 2012

They confirm your
Report in toto. They
confirm the supposition
that there is no Sanitary
Officer, except Dr.
Burrell, who will do
for your Medical Board.
Cooper, Surgeon to the

4th Drag. Gds, whose excellent
evidence you may remember
in the McNeill-Tulloch
Report, writes the best
~~letters~~ Sanitary recommenda=
tions after Burrell -

It will not do to
print these Papers in
your Report, because
it would necessitate
the printing of other
papers - They are not
complete without other
Published Returns which
we have - But, when
compared with these,
they constitute to me

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

130

October 2012

by far the most perfect
key to the history of the
War which is in existence,
& the most complete
reason for the disaster.
I will write tomorrow
to you a little sketch of them.
We have completed an
Analysis of them for
your private information
only. I question whether,
if you go over it, you
will not think it
desirable to add a
Resolution to your Report
for Commanding Officers
in ~~the~~ Sanitary ~~(illeg)~~/matters,
besides that already there -
You will see -

[end 14:536]

Yours ever faithfully
F. Nightingale

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

Great Malvern
Sept 26/57

[14:536-37]

Dear Mr. Herbert

The papers (sent to the
Commission) ~~on~~/of the "Sanitary
recommendations" for the
"Army in the East" contain
I find, three classes:

1. the correspondence
which passed through
the Director General's Office.

I send you by this post
a Digest of this, with
remarks. Please read
them & send them me
back by post - unless
I am to meet you in

London first -

I can conceive how very painful (& perhaps you will think uselessly so) it must be to you to go over all that time again - to me it was like tearing me to pieces. Still I think it is the most instructive history of the Sanitary part of the war I have yet seen - and the most suggestive for the conduct not only of ~~our~~/that war but of any ~~{illeg}~~/future war -

I must have it back, please, because on the 11 defects summed up in the last ~~page~~ sheet will be founded Regulations for Commanding Officers, which you will perhaps propose in one of your Sub=Commissions -

and also a little sketch must be given on the mode of procedure of the French War De=partment & our own Home Department in Sanitary matters - as a comparison with that of the Horse Guards.

It might be desirable to print in the Appendix to your Commission an ~~this~~ Analysis, ~~&/with illustrative facts,~~ of these "Sanitary papers," without the Remarks - You will judge of this. I do not send you the Analysis, because I have, in my Remarks, given a sufficient one

- The other two classes are
2. correspondence of Medical Officers
 3. extracts from letter books

which contain a vast amount of matter, both as to Scutari & the Camp. I will send you a Digest of each

{on the first f}
ever faithfully yours F. Nightingale

unsigned memorandum, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale - what Commissariat was ordered to provide - by Ld Raglan's G.O. of May/54; and the system of supply adopted by the Commissariat was found to be insufficient, and consequently the men} 2057/F4/66

The soldier was necessarily **[14:501-02]** dependent upon the Commissariat for every kind of supply - ~~both~~ in Bulgaria & still more in the Crimea.

By Lord Raglan's G.O. in May 1854, forwarded upon Treasury Minute, the Commissariat was ordered to provide, - to be paid for monthly out of the messing -

- Preserved Potatoes
- Chocolate
- Coffee
- Tea
- Sugar
- Rice
- Barley

&, to be paid for daily out
of the soldier's pocket money

Porter

Ale

Tobacco

[Coffee, Sugar, & for a
~~short~~ time, Rice, were
afterwards made part
of the regular Ration-]

The other articles were optional with
the soldier.

In about three weeks,
however, the above system
of supply ceased, in
consequence of various
irregularities & was in
short a failure -

No other system was
made to supply its place

for a considerable period.

[end]

{in another hand: P. 17 Line 4 stoppage actually was 4d ½ P. 332. {illeg,
illeg}}

initialed letter, lf, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale - Proposing a
meeting - & that Drewry must produce the Forms} black-edged paper [c1857]
2057/F4/66

I have just seen Farr.
He had not then
got the blessed Forms
back from Drewry,
who is as bad as
any washerwoman
about sending home
things on Saturday
night -

But I do think
it would be well

worth while to have
a Meeting tomorrow
& Drewry MUST
produce the Forms.

IF you could call
in Burlington St. today,
we might talk this
over, before you send
your orders to Farr.

The Pundits, I hear,
are verging against
Netley site -

Yours sincerely

F.N.

signed letter, 1f, pen 2057/F4/66

[14:537]

Dear Mr. Herbert

These are the "Regulations"
which seem to flow from
the Defects I have given
in the last sheet on the
Sanitary Correspondence
which I sent you -

This extraordinary
correspondence has made
me put down the usual
methods of sanitary
administration which I send as a sort
of preface to the Regulations.

I think ~~they~~/these all flow
from your Report, & I have
touched no other point.

but what is there brought forward.

Please return them to
me - as I must go over
them again before I see
you in London -

You are not "quitté" for
these Regulations - for there
are a good many more
coming.

[end] 14:537]

Yours ever faithfully
F. Nightingale

Gt. Malvern
Sept 28/57

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 6ff, pen 2057/F4/66

135

October 2012

Burln St Oct 9/57

[14:538-40]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have nothing to say
particular, except that
I have got one Diagram
& seen three lots of
Returns, since I saw
you -

1. The Diagram is
for the Q.M.G., & will
astonish our friends
of the Dark Ages at the

Horse Guards a little.
I have been asking
Military reasons for that
plan of killing people,
but have, as yet, found
none - I have not
shewn those calculations
to any one but Farr.

2. As to the Returns,
(1). Tulloch's are very
valuable. For ~~this~~/these reasons,
Clumsy as they are,
they shew what not a

man of the Army Medical
Dept knows a bit nor a
scrap of - Yet these
Returns are made up
from Andrew Smith's.
What has *he* been
about that, for the
last 20 years, he has
not ~~published~~/made them
up every six months?

From these Returns,
it is quite possible
to gather ~~what~~/which Stations
have stood still in

[in another hand} Miss Nightingale 9 Oct. 1857}
Sanitary measures, which
have made progress, &
which will want your
Barrack Commission -
I guess that Malta &
Corfu have been stationary.
The whole result is
most satisfactory &
shews that, from the
improving good sense
of Commanding Officers,
~~how~~ much has already
been done by Sanitary
means to reduce Mortality.

-2-

And a Paragraph might
perhaps be inserted in
the Report pointing out
what a proof this is
of how much may still
be done to diminish Death.

(2). I have stolen a
whole heap of Recruiting
Returns, which I ~~think~~/want
to shew you - You will
perhaps like to print
them. The number of
rejections amounts, in
some instances, to 63
per cent. The causes
(which are specified)

for which they are
rejected, prove that
we have a system,
which must ensure
for our Army the
finest physical speci=
mens in the world,
(saving, I suppose, some
of our best aristocracy)
You will say that the
ingenuity which
produces Scrofula,
Consumption & Premature
Mortality among such

a physical "pick" cannot have reached its very high ~~present~~ state of perfection without repeated trial. It far surpasses the ingenuity of Majendie & Co. in producing Scrofula among Rabbits, which was less quickly & less extensively done -

(3). The third set of Returns is ~~some~~ on Invaliding & Mortality/ies ~~Returns~~, of which the results are excessively curious. But Dr. Balfour

has taken them away to "cook" them -

It appears that the rate of Invaliding *under* 14 years' service is *lowest* among the "Household Cavalry", but the Mortality among such Invalids is *highest* - that the rate of Invaliding *under* 14 years' service is *highest* among the "Horse Artillery", but the mortality among such Invalids is *lowest*. The sappers & miners give almost the same result as the H. Artillery.

-3-

I have made a quite rough calculation, which must not be used till our Data are less rough, of how much this will raise our Mortality. You will see that the *relative proportionate* ~~of~~ mortality of each arm is much more kept to, than we expected. Your Cavalry will always be healthiest. And the Cavalry of the Line & Horse Artillery will be probably much alike. But we have not yet the Artillery Returns complete.

Household Cavalry

Aggreg. Strength		Deaths	Per
1844-52	} 10878	119	1000
Invalided			
1845-53	} 360	45	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	11238	164	= 14.6

Cavalry of Line

Aggreg. Strength		Deaths	Per
1844-52	} 55077	729	1000
Invalided			
1844-53	} 2559	168	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	57636	897	= 15.5

Foot Guards

Aggreg. Strength		Deaths	Per
1844-52	} 44388	891	1000
Invalided			
1845-53	} 1565	210	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	45953	1101	= 23.9

Infantry of Line

Aggreg. Strength		Deaths	Per
1844-52	} 231600	3969	1000
Invalided			
1845-53	} 24573	1832	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	256173	5801	= 22.6

Sappers & Miners

	Per 1000
With Invalids	18.2
Without "	17.7

I forget whether I ever shewed you a calculation which was verified by Dr. Farr, ~~which I made~~ for the Foot Guards, to shew how their Mortality would be raised by taking into account *both* the Invalids & those excluded in recruiting - I enclose it - But I had not then seen the Recruiting Returns I

now have - I suspect I have *underrated* the "Excluded Sick of Dangerous Diseases" -

3. Those French Extracts you left me are most valuable & should be printed principally for the fact that over-crowding & foul air produced Scurvy among soldiers better fed than the poorly fed population which yet had no Scurvy -

ever faithfully yours

F. Nightingale

[end 14:550]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

140

October 2012

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Oct/57 Miss F.N. The
"Regulations" & Dr. Smith's Blue Book - Her own Evidence - Dr. Hall's
recommendations} 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St.
London W.

Oct 9/57

[14:540]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dr. Balfour desired
me to read ~~the~~/his enclosed
to you - And, upon it, I
have to say that,
troublesome as it will
be to us to read through
a bulk "three times
the size" of what we
have already, I don't
see how we are to
write "Regulations" for the
future, without knowing what,

in the *past*, the Army
Medl Dept. have consi=
dered their functions,
& how they have
fulfilled them - Whatever
comes out in Dr. Smith's
Blue Book that we
have not seen, he will
always say, "This
overthrows your Report.
You see we have done
it all already" - And
Panmure will take it
~~all~~ for truth, without
giving himself the
trouble to see which is

truth. It would be very discouraging to be overthrown by a mere quibble of this kind - Therefore I say, "Yes, have it all". And I will undertake, (at least before next meeting of Parlt) to have it all analysed - & collated.

2. With regard to circulating my Evidence, I had wished it put off, knowing that it will bring upon me something disagreeable. But perhaps it is

better not to put off the evil day - If Smith wants to cross-examine me, ~~(illeg)~~ - he ought to have the opportunity -

3. Do you remember sending me Hall's own ~~case~~/statement of his Recommendations, (as drawn up by himself,) 2 or 3 months ago, which I returned to you, with observations? If you could let me have that document of Hall's again, tho' unfit to be used as Evidence, it would be useful, to me/us, as shewing ~~me~~ what is Hall's view of the duties of a P.M.O., as to Dietetic matters,

[end]

~~are is~~ Yours faithfully
F. Nightingale

30 Old Burlington St.
London W.
Oct 12/57

[14:541-42]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dr. Farr was called out of town this morning. He had heard, I did not rightly understand whether from you or the W.O., that he was to be employed under you on the Statistical Commission - And he left it in charge to me to say to you that he "should be very glad to do so" & that he "would be at your service any day next week" - He asks you, first, to supply him at once with

1. "Blank forms - Copies of all the forms that are in use in the Army Medl Dept for statistical purposes."

2. "Copy of each Return or Form filled up. To shew the usual manner of doing so-

3. "A copy of all Statistical Reports published by the Medical Dept of the Army" - To this he expects a return of *nil*.

4. " A copy of all Sir A. Tulloch's Statistical Reports .

5. Introductions to the Medical Officers of the Guards' Hospitals in London - to the P.M.O. at Woolwich Artillery Hospital - to the P.M.O. at Chatham, with the view of seeing the working of the present system of Returns.

This he wishes to do quietly & without official fuss -

The sooner he has all these, the better - Tulloch is not expected back till the first week in November. There is no harm in this - For Farr works slowly & is phlegmatic - And the farther on he is with his work, the better, before Tulloch's return - In fact, ~~let~~ you will have to settle it all with Farr.

I entirely see, with you, that upon a proper Statistical organization depends all future progress of the Army - The very publicity alone will enable you

to call these fellows to account, who have made a kind of Egyptian priesthood of their Military mysteries, which are no mysteries at all -

Tell Panmure, who preaches at some Assembly or Convocation of his free Kirk that, if he does not grant the Barrack Commission & the other for the "Regulations", he must propose a day of fasting & prayer for the poor soldiers condemned to die in Barracks - Why not? We have just done it for India.

But I hope better things - For, if they don't give you the "Regulations" & "Army Medical Board" to do, nobody will do them.

However, please try & get your foot into the "Regulations" in this Statistical Commission. You have

pointed out the way in your letter this morning to me. I enclose a few data which, if you thought well of them, might form a part of the suggestions in your Instructions to Farr.

2. With regard to the Medical School, the great thing will be to find the men for the Chairs. For the Sanitary

Pathology &
Chemistry, it

will be in vain to seek in the Army - Grainger or Parkes for the Sanitary & Aitken for the Pathology would, I believe, obtain most votes among Non-Army men - For the Surgery, it will be desirable to steer clear of Matthew, who has been appointed to the Edinburgh Army Chair - a good Surgeon, but with no one requisite for teaching - It is difficult now to get a good Teacher, for the Pupils are up to their Masters. But there must be good Army

men for this. [end ams]

Sir James Clark is, I think, the only other Commissioner you mention not likely to be in town at the beginning of next week or close of this - You will know best when the Q. comes back -

If you have our Scheme for the Medical School & like to send it me, I will re=consider any points.

Please remember that my Invaliding calculations are on rough & insufficient data - & must not be made use of, till revised - I dare say you may have discovered an error in the calculation too - But the *figures* of the Cavalry & Infantry of the Line are errors -

[end 14:542]

ever faithfully yours

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Oct 12/57 - Miss Nightingale - Oct 13/57 - on the Sub=Commissions}

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 Old Burlington St.

Nov 2/57

[14:542-43]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I hear a great deal of gossip about the Army Medical Board, viz. that Dumbreck & Pilleau are to be succeeded by Logan & Home, two better men - that Hall has bargained for the reversion of the Director Generalship - that Mouat is to have a place &c.

I hope that Panmure moved by idleness and Andrew Smith, is not

going to say that he
asked you to help
them, & you would not,
& so he has done the
best he could.

You will know whether
it will be possible for
you to urge upon him
immediately the
appointment of the
Commission on the
Organization - and, at
all events, on the
Regulations.

If he will not give
up the organization,
there would be two
proposals, 1. that
you should join the
Commission proposed,
of himself & yourself,
A. Smith & Croomes,
when you could, at the
worst, refuse to
sanction what is
imperfect or useless -
& have the reply in
the House

2. that you should
add to your Report a

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Medical Board Nov 2/57}

sketch of the evils,
with an existing Regulation
as an illustration of
each - and a proposed
Regulation as a remedy
for each -

I could, with very
little trouble, supply
you with a case & an
existing Regulation for
each evil, pointed out
in your Report, if you
would compose the
Code of Remedies -

I do not believe that
it would be possible for the
existing Organization to stand
against such a show=up

[end 14:543]

{on top of first f, vertical}
ever faithfully yours
F. Nightingale

signed memorandum, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

This is the first Proof
of the Description of the
Diagrams. If you approve
of this kind of way of
doing it, you will
perhaps return me
this Proof the first
thing in the morning
with your criticisms,
as I think it might
be improved - Dr. Farr
has a Proof too, in

[14:543]

order that he may
say whether the
inferences are correct.

It is the most
complete justification
of all that Sir John
McNeill has ever
~~said~~/asserted. They had
better have cried
"Peccavi" - For here
is ~~the {illeg}~~/damning
proof that he did

not advance a
statement which
was not more than
warranted - I shall
like him to see this,
when your Appendix
is out -

I hope you will
not think it
impertinent, if I
enclose a note of
his, which refers to

how your present
investigations in the
Barracks, of which
I have told him,
bear out your state=
ments in the Report -
& shews a little
what his indignation
has been with the
Q.M.G.'s & Army
Medical Departments

ever yours faithfully
Nov 11/57 F. Nightingale

This is the "Constitution"
of the Army Medical
Board, as proposed
in the Report. It
is extracted from
a fuller Sketch
which you ~~have~~/had,
giving ~~his~~/its Powers too -
(This Constitution ~~in~~/by itself, would
convey no idea to
Panmure probably, who is

stupid).

It should be
accompanied by a
sketch of the Powers.
Mr. Alexander would
do those of the
Medical branch -
Those of the Sanitary
we could extract
from the Sanitary
regulations, now
going to press, in

which a Sanitary
branch is pre=
supposed, & ~~They~~/which
must be compared with
it, for the sake of
consistency - The
Statistical branch
we must wait
to see Farr's forms,
~~f~~ in order to do -

Perhaps, if you
approve the
"Constitution," which

is almost copied
from yours, you ~~filleg~~/might
send it to press, &
we could draw up
the Powers, whenever
you ~~desire~~/direct it.

[end 14:543]

F. Nightingale
Nov 11/57

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale - Purveyor -
15 Nov 1857} 2057/F4/66

149

October 2012

Regulations

Nov 15/57

[14:543-44]

Regulations Proof -

Dear Mr. Herbert

You only can judge
about those Regulations -
I shall of course obey
orders - Unquestionably
they must agree with
the Report -

I think it may
be managed very easily.

The point, in calling
the *Pay Master* Treasurer
& the *Purveyor* Steward
(in the General Hospitals)

is that the Treasurer
takes one of the functions
of the Commisst (Banking)
in addition to being
Paymaster - the ~~Purveyor~~
Steward takes another
function of the Commisst,
& one of the Barrack Master,
in addition to his
Purveyorship - The real
difficulty however of
the name "Purveyor" is
that it brings him
under the Purveyor in Chief,
in London

whereas ~~we~~/you want to
centralize the power in
the Governor, vide Report.

However, I think
all this may be managed,
& the names *Paymaster*
& *Purveyor* kept -

The case of the Regi=
mental Hospls is different.

And, as your Report
says that the Purveyor
must be under the
Principal Medical Officer,
so must the Regulations
say - Ever yrs faithfully
F.N.

[end 14:544]

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 O. Burl St
Dec 19/57

[14:547-48]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have seen Tulloch's Diagrams.
They merely give the state of the Army
before & after 1837. Your Diagrams
take up its condition at precisely the
point where Tulloch says the
improvement begins & shew how
bad it is - It reminds one of Miss
Austen's young lady who had bought
an ugly bonnet & said there
were much uglier in the shop -
Or of Tulloch's own just indignation
with the Crimean people at the
Chelsea Board who said It might
have been worse. Tulloch & Balfour
seem to think that they will be in

some way to be blamed for the Army not being better - instead of our being very much obliged to them (which I am sure we are) for what they have done - The thing is however now to guard the future progress of the Army -

Would you think of putting some Note into your Report (after the Table of Mortalities before & after/37,) of something of the following purpose?

"The numerical results in this Table are well illustrated by the Diagrams, supplied by Sir A. Tulloch, shewing the diminished Mortality from different Diseases among troops serving on foreign Stations after the year 1837.

The improved condition of the whole

Army since that period is represented in contrast with the Mortality among Civilians of the same ages at home on the coloured Diagrams C & D.

An inspection of these two Diagrams will shew how much yet remains to be done for improving the health of the Army on foreign stations, while they also enable us better to estimate the almost incredible Annual loss of life on that Service in the years preceding 1837".

Dr. Farr was anxious that something of this kind should be put in.

Do not trouble yourself to answer this -

I do not hear a very good account of Dr. Greenhow's Sanitary Lectures at St. Thomas's Hospital - Mr. Whitfield, of St. Thomas's, whom you

know a little to be a good man, says
they give dry statistical facts & not
practical knowledge - He says of Mr.
Tufnell of Dublin that, altho' a
superficial man, he is a first rate
Lecturer for a Surgical Chair
more for that than for Medicine
So that is "bien trouvé"

[end 14:548]

I hope Mrs. Herbert is observing
absolute "recumbency", (a Hospital
word,) till 2 P.M. daily -

Believe me ever most sincerely yrs

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Dec/57 Miss F.N. Tulloch & Balfour - Diagrams - note to
be added - as to Dr. Greenhow - and Mr. Tufnell of Dublin.}

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/66

30 Burl St.
Xmas Eve

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have gone thro'
Ewart's "Colonization in
India" 4 Reports,
(which are only
Evidence) & marked
all the passages
which refer to Sanitary
business - If you
would like to have
the marked copy
rather than the
trouble of doing the

[9:50-51]

same thing, I will
send it you -

The impression it
leaves upon my mind
is, through much
evidence, often contra=
dictory, generally
clumsy, & flimsy &
always vague, that
the thing can be done -
i.e. the Sanitary Reform
can be worked - that
practical insight
in the details is
utterly wanting - but
that there is a prima

facie case, which is
entirely irresistible,
that men may live
in India as well
as in England, if
people will set
about it but that
nobody has set ~~it~~
about it.

An immense
number of other
subjects is treated
in the Report -
supply, revenue &c

The impression it
leaves is that the
only persons who

understand any of
the subjects are the
Civil administrative
people - & that all
the rest are idle
bunglers -

I have besides
(thro' Mr. Arthur
Mills) certain India
House returns of
mortality - very good
or rather very BAD -

And Balfour is
going (as a Xmas
present) to make
me up some returns
of diseases -

One curious fact
I have got at - that
at Dugshai, Subathoo,
Kussowlie, stations as
healthy as any English
climate, the troops
suffer intensely from
Diarrhaea - Why?
Because in the plains
the skin does the
whole eliminating
function - And then
they are sent up to
these hill stations
- without a rag
more clothing. Why,

if they did *not* have
Diarrhaea, every man
of them would die.
Oh how poor Nature
is abused, and
blamed, ~~for~~/who is only doing
her very best to
save us from our
own folly! which
ought to be the
thing blamed -

There are/A very good
useful popular
Sanitary ~~work might~~
~~be made even out~~
materials even in

~~of~~ Ewart's Report -
But I am more &
more convinced that
no real good will
ever be done except
by a Report calculated
to carry weight
with it - & compel
observance by
regulation -

Please don't
suppose that I am
staying in town on
account of the
business. Williams

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

156

October 2012

is very recalcitrant
(& was when you
spoke to me) about
my going to Malvern
at all. I have
not made up on/my
mind - but if I
stay here, it will
only be on account
of my own health.

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Martin's evidence (in said
Report) is all good, & sound
on general principles - But
like the man, there is not
a single practical suggestion.

[end 9:51]

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

Great Malvern

Dec 29/57

[14:550-]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Your behests shall
be observed as to the
"Coxcombs" - No one has
seen them but yourself,
Dr. Farr & Dr. Sutherland,
not even Dr. Balfour.

It is our flank=march
upon the enemy. And it
leaves them not a
word to say - "This is
what you have done
with the Army". They

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
cannot answer it. They
can only deny. There
will be plenty of that,
as there was at the
Chelsea Board -

157

October 2012

I could wish that
it were out, before fools
are thinking of the
Princess' marriage, &
wise men of the coming
"row" in Parliament -
The gigantic business
of organizing the India
Army makes all you

are doing only the more
important.

It is doubtless also
the more important to
avoid even the shadow
of a risk of the mere facts
in the Diagrams
forestalling the great remedies
in your Report -

2. I venture to send,
for your consideration,
a few remarks I have
just put down, in
which I have helped
myself largely from

Sir J. McNeill, to whom I wrote, as to the absolute necessity of separating the functions of Banking & Supply, the Offices of Paymaster & Purveyor in General Hospitals. When Mr. Croomes said it had never been done, he did not know how fearfully we had suffered from its "never having been done".

There is no hurry about it- But you would perhaps take it into consideration before you finally pass the "Regulations". ever yrs sincerely
F. Nightingale

{from the first f, written in the left margin}
I saw a book once in the Wilton Library, of the time of Cromwell, called "God's Revenge upon Murder".

This is what you should call the Coxcombs.

[end 14:550]

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

Gt Malvern
Dec 31/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

You received the Copy of the "Regulations" this morning. So did I. And I have gone over those for the "Nurses" carefully - and made the following Remarks, which I send -

I am really very sorry to worry ~~for~~/you -for all that is written in that long story might

have been *said* in
10 minutes.

If you would just
glance over it ~~illeg~~ however, &
if you approve my
emendations & their
reasons, send on the
M.S. to Dr. Sutherland
to be worked into
the "Regulations" - before
you meet at Wilton -
If you don't approve,
perhaps you will remit them back
to me with your

objections "for re=consi=
deration" -

The same thing I
would say about the
*Paymaster, P-22, General
Hospitals, P. 22, "Regulations."*
If you admit the principle,
perhaps you would send
my M.S. to Dr. Suther=
land to be worked into
the "Regulations" - If you
don't, perhaps you
would remit it back
to me with your
objections -

I am afraid I shall
have to worry you
again, now you have
received the "Regulations".
But it shall be as
little as possible.

I think '57, poor
old year, has been a
good year's work for
the troops - But I hope
'58 will be a better -
And so it will, under
you -

ever yours faithfully

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 31 Dec 1857 -Miss Nightingale - Paymaster}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/66

160

October 2012

Gt Malvern
Sept 19/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

In order that you
may see that I have
not been quite idle
in your absence, I
send you a few News=
paper Articles on
Netley - [These are not
all.] In the next
debate on Netley, I
should like some
M.P. to get up, unroll

[16:313]

these, & a great many
more, & remark
upon the beautiful
unanimity of the
British press &
the *common* sense
of the public.

Please return me
this curious literature,
as I have no other
copies of my works.

I hope you will
come here & look
at this place - a

very handy place,
when one can't go
abroad - & I don't
at all "want *not*
to be seen" -

But I hope you
will not dispute
my coming to London
too -

Among other things
I have to do there is this.
They want a Regimental
Hospital for 60 men
for the Hut Camp at
Woolwich - And they

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
are so obliging as to
say that Galton may
furnish them with
plans - I want it
to be a Model of
Regimental Hospitals
for unborn ages. ~~We~~/It is
a fine opportunity -
We have the plans
sketched out, but
cannot go on with
them till we all
meet in London -
Galton's draughtsman
has sent down the
first draught to me
here. yrs sincerely
F. Nightingale

161

October 2012

[end 16:313]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: 4 Feb 1858 - Miss Nightingale -
Upon the Notes} 2057/F4/66

162

October 2012
Miss Nightingale -

Gt. Malvern
Feb 4/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

The enclosed are
the Abstracts (completed)
of all the three Packets
of Army Medical
Correspondence I have
had at three different
times, from you -

(That is to say, these
proofs are not corrected -
But there is no more
"matter" to add.)

There is a good deal
intercalated here & there
as P.XVIII to P.XXVI Preface to Section I
& P. XII to P. XVIII appendix to ---- -
from the last Packet
you sent me - But
Appendix II to Section I
P XXXI to P XLVII is the
only entirely new
"matter" (from this last
Packet) which you
have not seen -

You proposed to
write me a letter, such
as I could print,
(immediately after

Ld Panmure's letter
of Instructions to me to write a Precis) - accounting
for the way I came by
this correspondence -
And I thought some
thing like the enclosed
Draft Heads would do - *put*
in your own way -
For, altho' we have
been in the habit
lately of writing
"Instructions" to ourselves,
I am afraid I am
not successful in
writing a letter to myself -

I have written a very
few lines of Preface
(which of course I shall
send for your criticism,)
saying that this Ay. Ml.
Correspondence had
thrown so much light
on the causes of the
"Sanitary ~~filed~~/condition of the Army
in late War" & on the "Sanitary
~~filed~~/requirements" necessary to be
made that, &c, I forgot
how it is put. The fact
is that nothing ever
enlightened me so much
as the reading of these
Papers - ever yrs faithfully
F. Nightingale

Heads of a letter
to myself -

[It must be ante=dated
say August/57]

1. The accompanying
packets of Papers relating
to the Hospitals &
Sanitary arrangements
for the Army in the
East having been
sent to me i.e. to you by the Army
Medical Dept, I
forward them to you
as they appear to me
(illeg)/essential for the
preparation of such a

Precis as you have
been instructed to
make respecting the
"Sanitary condition of
our soldiers, especially
with reference to their
treatment in Hospital"

2. You are at liberty
to make such use of
them in your Precis
as may best advance
the object in view,
viz. the improvement

3. I would suggest
that short Abstracts
be made of them,
setting forth the
contents of the papers,
and ~~that~~ any remarks
with regard "to the
Sanitary requirements
of the Army generally"
such as you have
been instructed to make,
& that these be

appended to your
Precis.

S.H.

I am entirely ignorant
of the way these things
are managed - And I
need not say that you
will probably see some
better way -

All these Abstracts
have been through Dr.
Sutherland's hands -

F.N.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/67

166

October 2012

Gt Malvern **[14:551]**
Dec 30/57

Dear Mr. Herbert

I hope you will not
be alarmed at the
infliction - It is not
going to go
on - I have
thought much of what
you said the last time
I saw you of what is
still to be done - And
I have tried to sum
up what you have done
& what you have still

to do.

The "little Celt" & Farr
will be your best
practical hands,
(under you.)

I have finished the
"Army Medical Corres=
pondence" during the
War. And I ask
myself, What was
the result of it all?

The sending out
of Lime Juice, which
was not distributed

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
till too late - & of Peat
Charcoal, which was
not wanted -

167

October 2012

The practical result
of all that "Correspondence"
may be fairly summed
up thus -

What can one say
more in condemnation
of a Department?

Lord Raglan was
the primary cause of
Andrew Smith's
appointment - Never
was there a more
fatal act. It cost
him his Army & his
reputation -

Believe me

ever most sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

The only letters in the whole
collection which mark
a Sanitary genius are
Cooper's, Surgeon, (4th
Drag. Gds - I think) But
he had the credit of a
most impatient spirit.
Though every one who
saw him was struck
with him, with his inde=
pendence & genius. He
is now at Manchester,

I believe - And it
might be worth while
to make more
enquiries about him,
though his temper
would unfit him for
the "Sanitary Member
of Council," I fear -
Dr. Sutherland was
much impressed with
the correctness of his
Sanitary views.

There is no hurry
about reading me -
It will do at any time

[end 14:551]

F.N.

{in another hand: Dec/57 Miss F.N. "Army Medical Correspondence" her
opinion of it - Surgeon Cooper - his sanitary genius - ~~Army Medical Board~~}

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale (Jan. 58 -
Medical Council} 2057/F4/67

Gt. Malvern

Jan 9/58

[15:272-73]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I am very sorry
you have lumbago -
I hope it is not
very bad & that
it is nothing worse.

I only write a
line to say *in re Hawes*
- (you know I am worse
than 7 idiots at Politics,
& therefore I have no

idea how this will
do) - your reply
is a complete one to
Hawes's proposal -
but, if Alexander
gives way, you
should have no
act or part in
Hawes's scheme -
better, then, to connect
the Sanitary element
with W.O., or Horse
Gds, & throw the
D.G. overboard -

The prestige of his
Office is then gone.
The "Regulations" must
be remodeled - for,
without your
"Instructions" to
Medl Council, the
whole thing is
worthless - Better
to keep your principle
intact & lie by till
better times than
fall in to such a
slough-

If the Medical Council is, on the other hand, won - (you gained the School) - I can't but think you will gain this too) - still Burrell must be had. What Alexander says is all nonsense. The Warrant does not apply to the Council. Even if it did, which it does not, there must be

exceptional departures from ~~principles~~ rules for the sake of a cause - [The old Medical Board consisted chiefly of Civilians] ~~Genl Peel should make Burrell a Depy Insp.~~

Without any paternal fanaticism for one's own inventions in organization, I

think you may safely say that Hawes has no invention at all (in that line of organization). He is the genius of *dis*-organization. Two men it would be cheap to the country to pension off on full pay - Hawes & Laffan.

[end]

yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

"Mrs. Dr. Blackwell"
 is in England for a
 few days. I thought
 it wrong to lose the
 opportunity of seeing
 whether she would
 do for the "N. Fund"
 & have asked her
 down here. She is
 come but I have
 not seen her yet -
 I shall report to
 you & whatever she
 is or says, shall make
 her no proposal,
 which pledges us,
 before that.

signed letter, 9ff, pen {not in FN's hand, except signature}
 2057/F4/67

Great Malvern
 Jan 10th/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I will only now
 answer your question about the
 proportion of Nurses to Patients -
 1 - a Ward of 40 Patients might be ef-
 efficiently served (but it would be
 hard work) with

1.40 Bed Ward
 minimum size
 for Regulation
 number of 4
 attendants

1 Head Nurse-Female
 3 orderlies -

With *no* number of Patients to a
 Ward *under* 40, *can the Regulation*
proportion of 1 Attendant to 10
Patients be adhered to.

2.20 Bed Ward
 requires 3 ½
 Attendants -

2 - With a ward of 20 Patients (cut,
~~the~~ scheme & arrange the hours and
 duties as you will) you cannot efficiently serve
 it with less than
 ½ Head Nurse (Female)
 3 Orderlies.

& the other Ward of this Head Nurse must be very near too, and the Female Superintendent must have power to monopolize her to one ward, if necessary.

N.B. the same number would quite as efficiently serve a ward of 25 or even 30 Patients: but, in the latter case, there must be one Head Nurse ~~must superintend~~ to each ward

3. 10 Bed Ward cannot be served by 1 Orderly plus 1/5 Nurse

3 - The Army system of 1 Orderly to 10 Patients, with a number not exceeding 10 Patients to a Ward, is upset as immediately by one bad case among the 10, as by 9 in the 10 -

For, ~~is~~ is the same Orderly to be on duty for the 24 hours?

The difficulty is practically got over by the Army with a permission that any "bad case" may select

any one he likes of his comrades (out of the Depôt) to be "told off" to attend upon him

This extraordinary regulation is equivalent to (& affords no other practical result than) granting opportunity for any quantity of spirits & "grub" to be smuggled into Hospital.

4. Female nurses not to be substitutes for Orderlies.

4 - The introduction of Female Nurses into Military Hospitals is not intended to supply the place of Orderlies - but to perform a class of duties which never has been performed at all in the Army - the only Hospital duties, hitherto performed, of those generally called such, ~~have~~ having been (in Military Hospitals),

Diet=carrying

Sweeping

Every thing which is "writing"

5. Naval Hospitals
Regulation No.
of Attendants,
1 to 7 Patients

5 In all Naval Hospitals, the Regulation number of Attendants is 1 to every 7 Patients: & this is, in dependent of Female Matrons & the overseeing class.

Civil Hospitals
have even
9 Attendants to
44 Patients -

In Civil Hospitals, the number is far greater of Attendants to Patients, - & is more determined by the size of the ward, than by the badness of the cases - e.g. in one Hospital where there are quadruple wards of 44 Patients, (11 in each compartment) the number of attendants is from 7 to 9 to the 44 Patients -

i.e.	1 Head Nurse	}	{1	_____
	4 Day	- }	or {4	_____
	2 Night	- }	{4	_____
	<hr/>		<hr/>	
	7		9	
	<hr/>		<hr/>	

And in another Hospital, where there are 40 Patients in one Ward,

-2-

1 Head Nurse
2 Day -
1 Night -

are found to do the duty efficiently - (though it kills the Head Nurse, if she is a trustworthy woman - but, with one more, she might do it well)

6. Same
number of men
will not do
same amount
of work as an
equal number
of women would

6. One woman does the work of three men in a Hospital - speaking of the duties discharged by Under Nurses in Civil Hospitals - for men are unaccustomed to those duties from their childhood up (in England) this is not to say that women of the class of *Under=Nurses* in Civil Hospitals should be employed in Military Hospitals, which unquestionably they should not, but it is to say that you will not get the work done (efficiently) with a smaller number of men than you would employ of women -

7. Hospital attendance an entirely new Subject in the Army-

7. The question of attendance has never been intelligently considered in the Army at all - & if you ask any Army Medical Officer what he would do in such cases as the above, he can give you no *practical* answer

I conceive it to be practically impossible to serve 4 Wards of Netley with 1 Head Nurse
4 Orderlies

for, as I have said *one* bad case in each ward ~~makes this~~/upsets the economy as ~~unmanageable~~/much as nine would.
do -

II.

8. Female Superintendent must practically modify the proportion of Female Nurses to cases according to circumstances, & not be tied up to 50 -

8. The Patients are not laid out, one bad case to every other, - bed & bed alternately, - as ought to be the case to work the proposal of 1 Head Nurse to every 50 cases.

Therefore I adhere to the Regulation, as amended by Sir J. MacNeill, Page 26 Art. 53,

"Nurses shall be selected & appointed by the Superintendent-General of Nurses for each Genl Hospl in a proportion *not exceeding one* Nurse for every 25 cases"

as being better than either my proposition or Mr. Alexander's
Because it must *practically* be left to the Supt (Female) to decide, &, in either of the other two proportions, an ill-inclined P.M.O. might make her duties almost impossible.

9. Sir John MacNeill

9 - Sir J. MacNeill did not "argue on the supposition that the Female Nurses are to be the only Nurses"
He wrote with the Draft Regulations before him - how indeed could one Female attend alone "to 25 (or even 20) men"?

10. Desirableness
of separating
the Convalescents

10. If the ultimate effect of the Regulations is to make Army Medical Officers separate the Convalescent from the sick, & have convalescent wards, it will have practically the most beneficial result that could be. & There are strong reasons for not allowing Female Nurses to Convalescents at all - any Female Supt would know this - & would, at most, give one to 100 cases, (if desired by the P.M.O.) merely to serve out wine, medicines & The *amended* Regulations would allow of this latitude

11. Hospital
Wards in the
Army nothing
better than
Barrack Rooms
at present -

11. A Ward in a Military Hospital now is nothing but a Barrack room, with an inspection by a medical officer twice a day. You want to

-3-

make it (by your new Regulations & your Female Nursing) into a place where the sick are *attended*. But this cannot be done by such a scheme as 1 Female Head Nurse }
6 Orderlies } to { 50 Patients, in, say,
6 (Netley) Wards,
though this would be more than sufficient for 50 cases in *one* ward.

But ~~this~~ wards of more than 25 beds would be, (SANITARILY) too large.

12. Regulation
as to 1 Orderly
to 10 Patients
requires modifying

12 - Art. 8. P. 30. Regulation about orderlies might require guarding. Practically it is broken every day, & in the extraordinary manner I have mentioned, which is much as if a Surgeon were to say "This operation is too much for me. I'll call out of "the window to a "Navy" to help me"

For the *most serious* cases are left to the *rawest* hands to nurse.

I should like to look over the Nurses' Regulations very carefully again, before they are finally passed

F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/67

175

October 2012

Gt. Malvern
Jan 17/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

[15:273-74]

1. I will send you
the rough estimate of the
difference of total cost
in attendance on wards
differently distributed,
as you have sketched
them - If you could
send me, from Genl
Storks, the present
rate of pay of the
new Hospital Corps,
it would be less rough -

(What you gave me
in London did not
contain the pay.)

But it will be but
a piece of special
pleading on our sides,
after all, grounded
on a false assumption,
viz. that these people
wish the soldier to be
well nursed - They
will always answer,
"we can get a man
out of the Depot to do
all these duties of
yours for nothing, who

is eating his head off
at our expence."

2. I am very glad
you are going to "convert
the bureaucracy" to the
"Treasurer" question in
General Hospitals. For,
if they are against it,
it will fail - But,
practically, if 300 Mr.
Kirbys were to swear
that there never had
been ~~one~~/a Treasurer, and 600 Sir B.
Hawes's that there
never ought to be one,
it should not make an

iota's difference in
your opinion - which
is formed upon the
mischief arising out
of this very defect
under the Hawes & Kirby
administration. It was
not upon their expe=
rience that you invented
General Hospitals -

If all the 600 Army
Surgeons were to swear
that Cholera was an
"inscrutable decree of
Providence" & it was

-2-

no use to drain, it would make no difference in your opinion. But, unless the Army Surgeon can learn to say this, he cannot enter into the kingdom of the A.M.D., as at present constituted. And so is it with the Hawes & Kirby kingdom.

3. By the way, did you see a capital letter of Dr. Rigby's in the "Times" of the 14th, on the constant ratio of ventilation to mortality in his Lying-in Hospital - There has been an appearance & disappearance of Phagedæna, according to ventilation, in the same way, in the Military Hospital you sent me an account of at Winchester - Many thanks for that long letter -

4. I hear, as I dare say you have, that Col. Macdougall is ~~to be~~ the Chief of the Staff College at Sandhurst -

There is to be one more Examination at Burlington Ho. under the present system, for Admissions to Woolwich - after which they become extinct animals. I suppose the entrance to Woolwich

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
will be exclusively
thro' the Sandhurst
Junior School now -
a great pity, don't
you think so?

178

October 2012

5. I think I shall
have to submit to you
some modifications in
the "Nurse Regulations",
before they are finally
passed - And it might
be as well if you thought
well to send me back
my paper on Nurses Pay
& Pensions.

[end 15:274]

My aunt S. Smith's address
in London is 6 Whitehall still -
ever faithfully yrs F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

179

October 2012

signed letter, undated 3ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale on the terrible state of the Army in India} 2057/F4/67

Malvern

Wednesday

[14:552]

Dear Mr. Herbert

This is only to say that, having heard from General Storks this morning that Panmure was expected tomorrow, *Thursday*, I shall come up to the old place, 30 Old Burlington St., tomorrow *night* -

This is not, of course, to be a gêne to you in your Manchester plan in any way - but only to signify that I shall be there, if you will be

good enough to come & see me, whenever you go & see Panmure -

[end 14:552]

The Indian news is terrible, or rather the goings on of the War Dept, with regard to it. We have seen terrible things for the last three years - but nothing, I think, like Panmure's unmanly & brutal indifference - What are the murders committed by these miserable Bengalese, compared to the murders committed by the insouciance of

[9:49]

an educated & ~~illeg~~/cultivated
Englishman?

However, you have
begun at the root of
the matter - the physical
& moral efficiency of the
Army - And, by carrying
your Reforms, all the
rest will follow, &
the Indian matter,
indirectly, too -

[end 9:49]

I have read Hall -
It seems to me that
he & I have been
doing the same labor
of love - without the
knowledge of one another -
viz. exposing the
Sanitary system of the

[14:552]

Army -

I have a mass of
Regulations ready for you -

Also, the letter press
for the Diagrams is ready.
These, I think, should
be printed in such a
form that they can be
re=printed for private
distribution, with the
sanction of a Government
Commission upon them.
They speak to the eyes
of the nation & will
carry its feeling with you.

Perhaps you will let
me know, ~~when~~/before I see you,
at what time ~~illeg illeg~~ you will
come - ever yours faithfully

[end 14:552]

F. Nightingale

You will not, of course, adopt any of the Suggestions, verbatim et literatim, which I have ventured to make - They are only medical facts, about the correctness of which I have consulted Farr & Sutherland, for your consideration -

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/67

Gt. Malvern
Jan 20/58

[16:257-58]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I sent you this morning, "as directed", a rough estimate of the comparative cost of attendance on wards of 30, 25, and 9 Patients respectively -

But, for fear it should be made use of "to our disadvantage", I pray you to listen to what I now want to say, (*not* "as directed",) upon the different alterations of Netley in your letter.

Any alterations you may see fit to advise, with regard to the wards at Netley, must, in the first place, provide for the *direct* lighting & ventilation

of every part of every ward - This is not the case - No throwing of wards together, no causing parts of wards to project behind will compensate for the evil produced by ill-lighted & ill ventilated *other parts*, left in doing so.

The chief ward=improvement made, by the first Commission, on the old plan consisted in clearing out ~~odd~~/all corners - And, in attempting to improve the new plan, the old defects must not be restored.

Again, the back buildings are much too close to admit of any projecting wards or parts of wards being thrown out behind - You would have two wells or "culs=de=sac", with stagnant atmosphere, on each side the corridor leading to the back buildings.

If you throw out wards behind, you would require to pull down all the kitchen & dining room buildings & remove them to a greater distance. If left, they would hinder ventilation & light - Also, in such a plan, every ward projected out behind would interfere materially with the lighting & ventilation of the whole building.

The projections in the old original plan of the Chapel & Dining Rooms across the line of lighting were bad, and every ward projected would make it worse - unless indeed the distance between each projection were at least 101 feet, as at Aldershot, which is impossible ~~to get~~ at Netley.

If, Plan 2, the adjoining wards are thrown together so as to produce

long wards with beds along the back & front - then the Ward windows into the Corridors would have to be altered from the present plan, (in which these windows are in reality glass doors,) so as to leave a sufficient wall space between each two windows for two beds -

The plan of joining two wards by excavating a dark passage through the Orderlies' room would not do.

These seem to me the principles to be kept in view in making the alterations. To some of them I should say directly, if I were you, *I won't have it*. Of others, I should like to see the plans, as you have kindly proposed, *VERY* much - The cost of attendance must also be considered - I see no alteration of plan which will not involve sacrifice of bed=space - And the Hospital will not accommodate the number its vast size ought to do - this will be another source of outlay. **[end]**

{from the first f, written vertically at top of page}

ever faithfully yours

F. Nightingale

Gt. Malvern
Jan 21/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

Pray excuse my
impertinence in the
enclosure - You will
not feel it so much
as I do -

Of course the only
value of Mr. Dasent's
speech is

1. that the "Times"
means to do your
Report justice

2. that it wants
to have time for an
analysis

3. that to send
it a copy, *as soon*
as you feel you can,
would be worth while.

ever yours faithfully

F. Nightingale

letter signed A. Clough, 2ff, pen {printed address:} Education Department,
Council Office, Downing Street, London 2057/F4/67
18 Jany 1858

Dasent of the Times

[14:975]

spoke to me on ~~yester-~~
~~day~~/Saturday about Mr. Herbert's
Report & the subject
of Barracks - As
soon as it appears,
he said they would
put into good hands -

only they must try &
get an early copy:
for which it seemed
to be his purpose
that they should
apply to Mr. Herbert
himself. Of course
I could say nothing
to that, all my
discourse having
been the importance

of the subject & the
necessity of waiting
for the information
contained in the
Report -

He spoke very
highly of Mr. Herbert,
but their information
appears to be that
Lord Panmure has
no sort of intention

of resigning for the
next two years -
Nothing came from
the Printers on Saturday,
but I hope something
will come to go with
this.
Have the Sp Tr
arrived?

[end]

Ever Yours
A H Clough

Gt. Malvern
Jan 23/58

[16:258-59]

Dear Mr. Herbert

1. The glass in Netley Corridors is intended *to open* double - not to be removed at all - (It would be impossible to remove it) - Such, at least, was the last plan I saw, sanctioned by the Comtee upon it.

2. It is better that there should *not* be an architectural correspondence between the arches of the Corridors & the doors of the wards, for Sanitary purposes. The piers are so thin that neither light nor ventilation are impeded.

3. The Hospital would not now be *unhealthy*. At least, it would be more healthy than any London Hospital. But it is quite behind the

day. It is most expensive for administration - It is not at all what the Great Military Hospital of the British Empire should be -

It would make a model Barrack for 2000 men -

4. To propose a GOOD Hospital plan ~~would~~/will be the key note to your Report - giving *plans, details, estimates* - This would, in itself, condemn Netley & prove your case. Otherwise, the Govt would find fifty Architects to swear that Netley is the best Hospital they ever saw, which is true now -

5. The site cannot be other than unhealthy.

6. In regard to the principles to be kept in view in alterations, you cannot afford to sacrifice any of those which

we have laid down together -

I send you a plan for the illumination of your Commn, provided they will not sacrifice the site:

1. Propose to provide for 800 sick.

You will never have more.

2. Keep your foundations

3. Have your corridor one story, with open terrace above.

4. Throw out 4 pavilions, 100 feet apart, behind the Corridor on each side. The pavilions to contain 3 wards in tiers

101 ft long

25 " wide

16 ½ " high

5. Remove the kitchens altogether from the centres of the square & place them behind - The

dining=rooms* will be on the ground=floor between the Pavilions.

*Or they may be made room for in the front of each Pavilion-
middle floor.

Part of the foundations will come in for this. The rest must be laid.

[end 16:259]

Rate of Pension (Nurses)

Jan 23/58

I cannot conceive how Dr. Sutherland could have made such a mistake as to the Nurses' Pensions - or how I could have so mis=expressed myself as to mislead you - The increase of the Pension *after* it has been awarded was never contemplated either by Dr. Farr or me - Nor did Dr. Sutherland understand it so, when we three talked it over in London - Unquestionably the only principle in pensioning is what you state - and "the 2 per cent (to increase annually till it "reaches 70 per cent)" was intended to be *upon the rate of wages received PREVIOUS to retirement*, - not upon the pension which, once

awarded, is to remain always the same -

Send me back my paper, of which I have no copy, (that I may correct it to make this clear,) at your own convenience.

It should be - "rate of pension to be *fixed* according to *rate of wages* received in year previous to retirement - 2 per cent being added ~~illeg~~/upon &c" for each year of *service* at &c
{in another hand: 23rd Jan. 1858 - Miss Nightingale}

Rate of Pension
(Nurses)
to ~~illeg~~/be fixed
according to
rate of wages
received year
previous to
retirement

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/67

Gt. Malvern
Jan 31/58

[16:259]

Dear Mr. Herbert

I do not see that you could say less - or more than what you propose about Netley -

For it is the exact truth -

I cannot help hoping that they will adopt your Barrack suggestion for it.

Sir Harry Verney's
fear of large Hospital
wards, because the
French have small
prison wards, reminds
me of the argument
used by the first
Netley projectors
against light (in
Hospitals) because
Col. Jebb found
small windows good
for solitary prisoners!!

I had heard that
Panmure is very mad

about Netley. It does
not much signify,
I suppose - If God
would make Sanitary
laws, we are not
responsible for them.
We are not the
inventors or even the
discoverers of them.

But I really have
nothing to trouble you
with, except that
I am very sorry you
still have Neuralgia,
& glad you are going

to Paris & not by
night.

[end]

ever faithfully yrs

F. Nightingale

If you can lay your
hand upon my Nurse
paper, send it me
here, please - But it
does not signify.

{in another hand: 31 Jan. 1858 - Miss Nightingale - Netley}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

190

October 2012

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: 4 Feb 1858 - Miss N.- shd try
Malvern for Neuralgia} 2057/F4/67 [8:658]

Gt. Malvern

Feb 4/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I am very, very
sorry to hear that
you have your old
enemy.

I think it is
mere quackery to
advise a man to
come down here for
a few days - or to try
water=treatment in

London, when going
on with all his
Ho. of C. business
&c &c -

The causes which
brought ~~it~~/the thing on must
be suspended, in order
to send it away
again - And I think
both Homœopathy &
Hydropathy when they
says otherwise, are
quacks -

But I do very much wish you could give this place & the man here a fair trial of 4 &/or 6 weeks, if it were possible, - I believe it is the only cure for Neuralgia - & that it would destroy your liability to its recurrence, which surely is worth while -

I asked the man here, who is *not* a quack -

- in a general way your question - And he said the same thing -

Without pretending to judge about the Ho. of C. business, surely such a lull as this might be managed - some time soon And, about our business, we would disinterestedly do *all we could* in your absence, viz. the detail, leaving the management of the principles till you could come back - ever yours
F.N.

signed letter, 6ff, pen {in another hand: Fb 9 '58--commission returned from Paris--correspondence of Hall & Smith--shall it be published?}
2057/F4/67

30 Old Burlington St
Feb 9/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I really trust you
are better - as I saw
your name in the Ho.
last night - That is
the first thing.

[16:259-60]

2. I dare say you
have seen all your
Paris Commissioners - They
seem to have come back
strengthened in the
"Pavilion" view of the

Hospital question -
thinking that no
further alteration
can be made in
Netley - & that all
that can be done is
to recommend it as
a Barrack -

3. I am come
back, as you see -
I did not write to
you, because I was
afraid you would say,
"Don't - we don't want
you", when it would

have been sheer
impertinence in me
to have come.

4. I think it is
curious in the "Times"
Article of this mornng,
to see A. Smith
coming out in the
character of a
complainant - & a
reformer, about the
Barrack & Hospital
question - And I
wish ~~they~~ it would not
attack P. Albert
& the D. of Cambridge,
which sets them

against us - ~~&~~/men who both,
are certainly far more progressive than
A. Smith. **[end excerpt 16:260]**

But this brings
me to what you say
about the Abstracts.

5. There is a **[14:554-55]**
great deal to be said
upon the whole
question in your
letter - But I will
only take up your
time with one thing -

I adopt gratefully
all your amendments.
- except, - I *think*
I see a principle
at stake where you
see only a "fine dis=

-2-

inction" in the administrative question -

(1) But the point about the publication of the ~~papers~~/letters is, as you say, the important one - & one on which you only can decide -

My own feeling is, ~~it~~/the public is now occupied about other things - but it is quite upon the cards that, if it takes interest some day about this Barrack

& Hospital question, all that can be learnt about the deficiencies of the Army Medl Dept may be called for - And I think it in the highest degree important that A. Smith should be allowed to tell *his whole case now* - If I were Pres. of the R. Commission, I should therefore write to him to ask him if he

has any more papers
he wishes to produce,
(have his answer in black & white)
& print them in an
Appendix with a
Prefix by yourself.

I do not think as
you do, the Public
would read them -
I do not think you
would find two other
people who, like Dr.
Sutherland & myself,
would have the
patience to "*diagnose*"
them -

And therefore I think
it the more important
that the whole case,
as told by A. Smith
himself, should ~~be~~/come
out - while it *can* still
be "*diagnosed*" -

This brings me to
answer one of your
objections - We have
given the case exactly as
they have given it
to us. We have even
~~actually~~ used Hall's
own Abstract, verba=
tim, of his own
recommendations
& not ours -

-3-

(2) I have a feeling
about historical justice.
History, right or wrong,
is written in a very
different way now
from what it used
to be - Macaulay &
Lamartine do not
write, (as in the
Egyptian hieroglyphs,
of the reign of Bocchoris,
of Victoria's reign,
"In this reign a
lamb spoke" - The
whole Crimean story

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

196

October 2012

will be carefully sifted
some day -

Surely, the justice to
our poor men, who
are lying forgotten
already in their
Crimean graves, is to
let blame rest
where blame is
due - *not* in order to punish
the offenders but to
prevent a recurrence
of the offence -

Let the truth be
known that, with
the Medl Dept & the
Military authorities,

not with the Home
Govt is the, I will
not say fault but,
ignorance - *

If you like it, I
will take out every
stricture upon the
Divisional Doctors,
who don't deserve
much -

But it *must* lie
with Smith & Hall.

And I will ~~modify~~/blame
~~about~~/a little more the Military
authorities - Altho'
I do think Hall
*You will defend Ld Canning,
but you won't defend yourselves -

acquits Lord Raglan
(most unconsciously)
out of his own letter
to Smith
ever yours faithfully
F. Nightingale

I hope your Netley
report will give, once
for all, all that is
known of Sanitary
principle regarding
Hospital Engineering-
WE are sadly behind
the rest of the world.

Sir H. Verney came
to Malvern to see me
about it. He is ignorant
but agog.

[16:260]

[end 14:555] [end 16:260]

signed letter, 3ff, pen {in another hand: Feb/58 Miss Nightingale who shd
review the Report.} 2057/F4/67

30 Old Burln St
Feb 11/58

[14:976-77]

Dear Mr. Herbert

If you have regard
for the different styles
of the Reviews, you
should not have Ld
Stanley for the "West=
minster" - Lord Stanley
will write so as to
make people *think* -
Only Chadwick will
write so as to make
them *do* - Ld Stanley
will take your facts

& ~~put~~/reproduce them *out of*
their proper proportions,
and though he will
make a good popular
Article, he will never
make a good practical
one.

The Westm. handles
these subjects & disposes
of them practically.
The Quarterly only
munches them as
an ass does thistles.

I know nothing
against Chadwick

as a publicist - As an
administrator he is
detestable - But he
is the only man in
Europe who could
handle your Report
as it ought to be
handled -

I *had* written to
him as soon as I
received Mrs. Herbert's
note last night -
And though I do not
think that compromises
you to anything, I
should be very sorry

I confess to see Lord
Stanley in the Westm.

Do not have *Winter* -
He is a mere medical
man & will produce
a mere medical Article.
If Farr can't do it
himself, which he can,
have Ld Stanley for
the Quarterly, & Farr
for the Medico-Chirur=
gical Review -

Howell shall be
seen tomorrow for the
Edinburgh - he *is* in
town -

Kingsley has been
written to tonight
for "Fraser" -
J.H. Burton for the
"N. British" -
Southwood Smith
for the "British Quarterly".

Do not forget
Dickens for the comical
side for the Household
Words -

Please send me your
final behests early
tomorrow morning -
As Chadwick may
come in the course of

the day - And I must
not compromise you -

I have not done
any of the others
myself, as it is
better that your
name should be
used in all.

[end 14:977]

ever yrs faithfully
F. Nightingale

signed letter, 6ff, pen 2057/F4/67

-1-

30 Old Burln St.
Feb 12/58

[14:977-79]

Dear Mr. Herbert

1. I have not yet
heard from Chadwick -
And I think he might
be got to write in
the "National" - a very
rising Review, which
has taken the same
ground, as to social
questions, as the
"Westminster," & is
not so dogmatic on
the religious question.

I think, therefore, if you have not yet done anything about Lord Stanley, I would let him stand, if such is your opinion, for the "Westminster", Farr for the "Quarterly", & Balfour for the "Medico-Chirurgical" - Balfour, as you know, is no authority at all on Sanitary questions - And, therefore, could you give him a hint

to take it up on the *Medical* question, viz - shewing the Medical profession how much your Report does for them, instead of being against them.

In that case, I think he will do - Otherwise, he is stupid.

2. I enclose you a note from Howell - I think, if you would write to Reeve *today*, it would be best. But if you can't

shall I? I know him.

3. There is the "Quarterly
Edinburgh Medical &
Surgical Journal", -
much read by the
Army Medl Dept -
Shall I write to Sir
J. McNeill to manage
that ~~for you~~ and
recommend Dr. Begbie,
who would do it
well?

4. I think, if you
would write to the
Editors of the "Athenæum"
& "Leader", it would
be best, merely

asking for an early
notice?

5. The "Foreign Quarterly"
is extinct -

I would rather have
one of my old
soldiers to defend me
than any of you all
a great deal. The
only answer to the
"Guardman" is in
the ~~old~~ "Private soldier's"
letter this morning -
"Touchstone" & is no

answer at all &
might be picked to
pieces by any body,
who knew any thing
of the subject, of whom
fortunately for us
there are very few -

The arguments

1. about the Police
2. " Canada
3. " the Tower
4. " Cavalry

are all fallacious &
blunders, & might easily
lay us open to objec=

tions from those who,
as I say, are
fortunately few -who
can see a blunder -

The Cavalry question
however brings us to
Gymnastics - and that
must be looked to soon.

I hope you are
better & will not
go out today -

I enclose an "official
letter" to you which
I have long felt to
be necessary.

ever yrs faithfully
F. Nightingale
The common sense of

the last paragraph of
the "~~Old~~/Private Soldier's letter
beats us all.

The "National" has
been writing Military
articles lately.

I have just seen
Lord Stanley's note.
I will think of
somebody else for the
"National" & keep
Chadwick to the "Westm."
Chadwick just come!

1. I think Ritson would be worth writing to - Because he carries the Manchester local Press with him - which is of more value than London imagines - Let him put an Article in the "Manchester Guardian" -

2. I think the "Athenæum" should be treated respectfully - And the Editor asked to do it. It is the only paper of many professional men.

3. For the sake of the Drs, the "Medico=Chirurgical" must also be treated respectfully - And Farr or Carpenter (the Editor) would do it well -

4. I don't think Chadwick can be offered any Review but the "Quarterly", if he does not have the ~~Edinbur~~ "Westm." He is a dangerous enemy - And he carries with him all the Shaftesbury

Sanitary party. If he does not write *with* us, he will write *against* us, especially if neglected - And he is much more read in Europe than any one ~~else~~/Sanitarian - Some of his things have been translated into every language -

5. If J.H. Burton fails, Sir J. McNeill might be asked for the "N. British" - Not otherwise, I think - His name has become a watch=

word of a party, by no
fault of his -

Would Mr. Herbert
send today by post,
with W.O. stamp,
copies to

1. John Hill Burton Esq
Advocate
Edinburgh
2. Southwood Smith Esq
M.D.
St. George's Hill
Weybridge
3. Rt Honble Sir J. McNeill G.C.B.
Granton Ho.
Edinburgh

These people ought to have
it, whether they write or not.
F.N.

[end 14:979]

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale March 3 1858
2057/F4/67

This is in re "Constitution
Army Medl Council" v.
"Weekly Statistical Return" -
& refers to the two
papers sent on Monday.

There is no hurry -
But the thing stands thus.
All this last month the
"Regulations" have hung
fire- Because Farr
would not write the
Statistical ones till
Sutherland had written
the *Sanitary* ones.

And Sutherland would not write the Sanitary ones till Farr had written the Statistical ones -

Farther than this, you will find the "Report", the "Regulations" & the "Weekly States" all at variance -

This will not do -

I have therefore written the enclosed Draft Regulations for

Sanitary reporting, which Sutherland has condescended to endorse -

And which, if approved by you, ~~may~~/might go into the reprint of the "Regulations".

Farr should be requested to write *his* Regulations for *Statistical* Reporting in accordance with them, *IF* approved by you -

And one line ~~in~~/by you in your own Report ~~of~~/for the *Sub=Commn* on Statistics will arrange

the matter -

The *weekly* Report for *Statistics* is important (for reasons I have given) at least in the United Kingdom -

And the *third* Draft Regulation, (see Draft enclosed), will, if carried, give the most valuable assistance to *civil* reporting on health, which ought to bribe Farr's assent.

F. Nightingale
March 3/58

Wilt67: is this letter in?
signed letter, undated 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale India},
black-edged 2057/F4/67

I wrote to Lord Stanley
a letter, (in my usual
temperate terms & with
the moderation which
is my characteristic,)
about the affair at
Dum=dum, where
1800 women & children
having been packed
into a space for 300,
500 of them died
of Dysentery - And all
within 5 miles of

[9:50]

Calcutta - And the Govt
Officer, instead of
dispersing them imme=
diately, drives back
to Calcutta & makes
a Minute. Really
I can remember nothing
in the Crimea, (for a want
of all organization) to
compare with this -
And then people say,
"It's all the climate.
What can you expect?
Women & children
WILL die in India"

I wrote to Lord Stanley,
pointing out how urgent
such facts make a
Commission of Enquiry.
He answers:

"I can only say at
this moment that the
Dum=Dum affair
shall be fully enquired
into." [I hope *not*
by *old Indians*] "I
had seen it, but
thank you none the
less for reminding me" -
If it has "reminded" him
to do it the old way,
it will be no good - I
hope "at this moment" means

that *another* "moment" is coming.

Martin & Tulloch
were not examined
yesterday before the
Re=organization Commisssn,
as intended - but Genl
Franks & Major Holland were.
Martin & Tulloch are
to be examined on
Monday - And I have
written a sentence for
Martin (which he has
inserted into some written
Evidence of his to be given in)
as to the necessity of
a Sanitary Commission -
The Dumdum enquiry, if
fairly gone into, must bear so
heavily on somebody, (possibly Linton
who is at Calcutta,) that I should *hope*

{from the bottom of the first page}
it would initiate a real & searching

Sanitary Commission ~~Enquiry~~

[end 9:50]

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale March 16 1859 -
on the delay in printed the Forms.} 2057/F4/67

March 16/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

Farr complains
that the printers at
the War Office are so
very long. [I think he
is also very long himself]

1. His Statistical
FORMS are still, he
says, in the Printer's
hands - And we
cannot finish our
"Instructions" in the

"Regulations" without
them. He promised
to write to you to
ask you to "touch up"
Mr. Drewry - But,
in case he does not,
I do -

2. He has finished
his part of the
Statistical Report -
which is very able,
but omits all mention
of the defects which
made ~~it~~/the Commission necessary.

{the following paragraph is crossed out}

He wants an order
~~for~~/from you to print it,
before discussing it in
the Commission. I
hope he has written
to you -

3. The only point
(among the enclosures
I send) for your
immediate consideration
is that about this
bundle of "Sanitary
& Statistical
Regulations" -

F. Nightingale

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale March 18 1858 On Capt Jervis' Article for the Westminster. & on Dr. Farr's "Admission & Discharges Book"}, black-edged paper 2057/F4/67

Dear Mr. Herbert

1. I cannot help saying
(with regard to Capt.
Jervis) that Sutherland
& I were *appalled*
by his letter - It is not
only a stupid letter -
It is a bad letter -
It is fifty years
behind the age - It

supposes that Medical
Officers are to be made
efficient for the health
of men by having a
little more pay - And
it has every Military
& exploded prejudice
about Military authority
which nobody wishes
to attack -

I have great hopes
from your interview

with him this morning.
But I don't think
even you can make
even a "worsted
purse" out of such
a "sow's ear" -

Now the Westminster
is quite sound on
all these Sanitary
questions - Both
Sutherland & I
know Dr. Chapman-
And, if you fail

in educating Capt.
Jervis in half an hour,
you must let us try
our hand with Dr.
Chapman to make
him exercise his
Editorial power upon
the Article, which is
an important one -

2. I saw Farr last
night - And he brought
the Proof of his
"Admission & Discharge
Book" - It is one of the

simplest & most
beautiful things I
have seen, & shews
the man's ability -
But it will necessitate
some additions to your
"Statistical Regulations,"
of which I sent you
the mangled M.S.
yesterday - for Press -

If Mr. Drewry could
throw off Proofs of those
& of the "Nurses' Regulations",

(sent you last night,)
we might then finish
~~your~~/the "Regulations" for
your criticism this week -

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale
March 18/58

Please make Mr.
Drewry send us back
all our M.S.S. It
saves our time -

Have you heard
from Mr. Elwin?

If you can lay your
hands upon the "Army
Medical Correspondence"
Proofs without trouble,
the Bearer would bring
them back -

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/67, see 43395 f34

30 Old Burlington St. W.
March 23 1858

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have been some time hesitating as to the course I ought to take, with regard to the large Fund which is called by my name, and which was so generously placed in my hands for the purpose of being applied to a most useful and beneficent object.

After allowing a time to elapse fully sufficient for forming a judgment, I find my health so much impaired and I am consequently so unequal to

begin a work which, to be properly performed, will require great exertion and unceasing attention that I feel it incumbent upon me and due to the contributors to beg you to communicate to the Trustees and Council my inability to undertake the task.

This communication is very painful to make, for I hoped by my exertions in the work proposed to me, to mark my deep sense of the confidence reposed in me, and I looked

forward to the attainment of an object which has always been nearest my heart.

But I strongly feel that the realization of these objects ought not to be indefinitely postponed, nor a large sum intended for a benevolent purpose to be allowed to lie useless, because I am incapacitated by illness from undertaking its application.

I must therefore under these circumstances ask you and the Council to consider in what way the objects contemplated by the Contributors may now best be

effected -

I remain

dear Mr. Herbert

most faithfully & gratefully yours

Florence Nightingale

Rt Honble

Sidney Herbert MP

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale March 29 1858 On the Netley Report being referred to Laffan, Mapleton & Co} 2057/F4/67

March 29/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

Genl Peel has referred your Netley Report back to the "2nd Netley Commission", which means, I suppose Laffan, Mapleton & Co. Perhaps this was unavoidable - Perhaps you knew it - Any how this requires no answer.

Yours ever faithfully

F. Nightingale

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale to keep back Instructions to Medical Board for conduct of business. April 23 1858} 2057/F4/67

April 23/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I hope that you
are better today.

This is only to say,
will you keep back
the "Instructions to
the *Army Medical*
Board" till I see you?

A very important
Instruction, which
I omitted, has occurred
to me to submit to you -

ever sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

incomplete letter, undated 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Netley} 2057/F4/67

I had a long letter this
morning from that
Princess of pompous
old women, Sir Harry
Verney. It is not worth
troubling you with -
But he details at
great length a conver=
sation he has had
with the Bison - in
which the only thing

that strikes one is that
the Bison is prepared
to defend Netley in
the Ho. of Lords *with*
evidence, of which he
has plenty & too much.
But *not* prepared
to resist its being
turned into a Barrack.

If this is so, to shew
what a Hospital *ought*
to be & then condemn
Netley
as a Hospital, ~~not~~ as a Barrack
it is princely, is the plan.

2. Winchester Military
Hospital is the worst
possible form of
construction - It
combines the outside
corridor covering one
front with the
inside staircase -
The result is that
every ward commu=
nicates with every
other ward. And
the top has all the
foul air - Netley
is much better
than this as a Hospital.

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/67

April 24/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I am greatly
delighted to see the
Barrack Report.

And I send in
return what that
unspeakably wicked
Drewry - beside
whom Orsini is
an ass - has sent
here, after keeping

both a whole week.

The enclosed
are the Instructions
(for the Regulations)
on Farr's forms.

I think, if you
please, the sooner
Burrell & Galton
have their copies
of the Barrack
Report, the better -

Although I dare say
they will not
"refresh themselves"
on Sunday with
it as we shall.

Would you like
any figures relating
to

ventilation
cubic space
kitchens
as to Croyden &
Chatham for yourself

before they are put
into a Report?

Drewry has
caused a frightful
waste of time -

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: F. Nightingale April 24./58 Enclosing Instructions for
the Regulations on Farr's forms.}

signed letter, 7ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale May 3 1858 on
Dr. Sutherland's Claims} 2057/F4/67

30 O. Burln St.

May 3/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I will answer your
question in the way of
business - And you will
extract what you
judge best for the W.O.
I suppose they will
take your word for it.

Sutherland has
given the full number
of Office hours to the
Barrack Commission
every day since it

began - And he has only charged his "days" at all since the day you *first [illeg]/summoned* your Barrack Commission at Wilton.

But, besides that, he has given his "extra" hours to your two other Commissions, upon ~~he~~ which he was requested* & consented to serve. He might have charged for these beyond his £3.3 a day, but did not - because

*by the War Officer
(viz. the "Regulations" & the "Medical School" Commissions)

he considered it a labour of love - had these Commissions been the emanations of *different* Govt. Offices, he would have charged the *different* Offices, & charged beyond the £3.3 per diem. He has given more time to the Barrack Commission alone than Burrell has - But Burrell has always shewn his face at the work=shop, and Suther=land has done most

of his work here -

Sutherland's name is still on the Home Office books - And he has occasionally had matters referred to him by the H.O. since his return from the Crimea & answered to the reference & done the work. but he has never charged the H.O. a single day's work, altho' entitled to £3.3 a day, *since his return home*, because

-2-

he considered that he could not serve two masters - the Home & the War Office -

During the whole of the time that your Royal Commission was sitting, he was therefore receiving no pay at all - altho' keeping himself out of other (paying) work for the purpose -

Till Oct 26/57 you will observe he has

not charged a day

[He gave up a permanent appointment to go to the Crimea - And he might be earning, and has earned £7.7 a day & his expences, on private Sanitary business]

Since Oct. 31/57 I have seen him every day, with the exception of five weeks at Malvern, & I could assert upon my honor that his whole time, not only Office hours, has been given to Govt business -

And, during the week he was with me at Malvern, we did nothing else all day & every day.

He is very silly in saying, as he always does, that "he comes here to help me", - as if we were "refreshing" ourselves

with a general view
of civil cess=pools,
instead of confining
ourselves to *Army*
cess=pools, as we
always do!

I have always
considered his time
as Govt time, bought
& paid for - and
have never asked
him to do a single
thing, in ~~the~~/any general
line of business, except

once, when

Sir J. Liddell

referred his Woolwich Hospital plans to me, &
Sutherland
helped me. He comes here,

-3-

and dines & drinks
tea here, & has done so
every day for the last twelvemonth;
because he is so queer
& such a hypochondriac
that, if he did not &
had not me to help
him, he says and I
believe it, he should
be in bed - That is, I
believe it, after the
fashion of a R. Catholic
Bishopric *in partibus*.
For Sutherland is a
man incapable of
determining to do any

thing but what he
likes & incapable of
determining to day what
he will like tomorrow -

For all that, he has
more brains than all
your other men put
together, ~~he~~ and has been
absolutely essential to
the business - and when
I compare the work
we have done with
the work which was
done by the Board of
Health or by the ~~Public~~
Health of Towns Commission,

I think there is cause
to be well satisfied -

At the same time,
we are losing *now*
much precious time
in some of the things-
owing to the necessity
of employing excessively
occupied men, like
Dr. Farr & Capt. Galton.
I hope we are not
thereby losing our opportunities
or wasting the
impression made on the
public.
But I do wish we

could get Farr's Forms
passed - He has not
yet received them from
the Printer -

I hope you are better -

Believe me

ever yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

I must just add
that Mrs. (not Dr.)
Sutherland told me
that he "had done
"nothing at his private
"affairs since October
"last - he had been
"so busy with his public
"ones."

-4-

I think we shall be
beaten at the Netley
affair by dishonest
management - Mapleton
sees each of the Pundits
separately, as he says,
to give "information" -
Not one of them all,
either old or new,
not Mapleton himself,
defends the Netley site.
But there seems to be
a *parti pris*, an
understanding to get
the Govt. out of the

scrape -

If this is the case,
the only way will be
to give them the go-by,
and for the Aldershot
plans & the Aldershot
site to referred
to you for your proposed
General Hospital &
Medical School -

F.N.

signed letter, 5ff, pen, black-edged paper 2057/F4/67 [8:659-60]

Gt Malvern

Sept 28/58

Dearest

I write to you to trouble you with this, because I suppose you will hardly have been able to make that melancholy journey North.

I will say nothing about her - whom you have lost - Because praise of her, as of Lady Pembroke, would seem almost sacrilege from me to you - I

write but little & only on business, knowing I can say nothing you will not have already felt, & believing you understand me sufficiently to make it needless -

I had a few lines from Mr. Herbert yesterday - a few of his kind, manly words of deep feeling such as he only can write -

What I want to say is only this:

1. will you, when he

resumes his guardianship
of your Infirmary, tell
him that, of the three
"Schemes" I sent for his
consideration, I think
that marked (I) in the
second letter is the
best - & that I would,
upon further thinking,
quite decidedly, give
the discretion about
"Patients' exercise" to the
"Sister" - and ALL the
"Stair-cases" to the
"Matron" - I think this
will prevent some
collision - the wards
& all their appurtenances
remaining to the "Sister",

responsible to the "Matron"
- the "Patients' exercise"
remaining to the "Sister",
responsible to the Surgeon. **[end 8:659]**

2. would you tell **[16:314-15]**
Mr. Herbert ~~that~~/sometime that
Neison has read a
very mischievous Paper
at the British Ass. at
Leeds, reproducing in
full his fallacies
about overcrowding
having nothing to do
with Consumption &
condemning the conclusion
of Mr. Herbert's Report.
I have written to Farr

-2-

about it because, if not answered, the matter will do us much harm.

To be as short as possible:

Mr/Neison adduces the Reg. Gen. Statistics as to overcrowding. Some one in the Reg. Gen. Office has totally mistaken the question of overcrowding & has produced great mischief to our cause, on account of these Population Tables being quoted as authority -

Thus:

{two dotted circles with solid circles inside and the words Liverpool, Manchester, in the latter case the solid circle is much smaller than the dotted one}

Dotted circles - Registration districts of which the population is given by Reg. Gen.

Black circles - actual densely inhabited parts.

Now *Greenhow* compares the density within the dotted circles & *not* within the black ones & shews that, inasmuch as the Manchester one is much less densely peopled than the Liverpool one, & yet has the same Mortality from Phthisis,

therefore density does not influence Phthisis, *therefore* overcrowding is rather a healthy thing - the real fact being that the density for Manchester & Liverpool is very nearly the same.

Neison seems to have done the same thing.

But the worst part is this - Surface density has in reality nothing to do with the matter & Mr. Herbert never said it had. It is density *in rooms*. Our Barracks have a smaller surface density generally than any town or perhaps village population in the kingdom, but they have

generally a far higher *room density*. And this it is which does the mischief -

Dr. Farr ought, on public grounds, to correct this public error, as far as the Reg. Gen. Statistics are concerned - And the best way would be for him to address a correction to Mr. Herbert, as Chairman of the R. Commission -

I am going up to London on Saturday, because I don't want them to do anything about some Regimental Hospital plans without me -

[8:659]

[end 8:659] [end 16:315]

-3- When Mr. Herbert
has anything to say to
me, perhaps he will
write to me there -

I hope you are
pretty well.

Believe me, dearest,
ever yours anxiously
& sorrowfully

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale 28 Sept 1858 Salisbury Infirmary Neison
doing mischief at Leeds - Fallacy that overcrowding does not produce
consumption}

Signed note, fl, pen Written on the back of a folio in another handwriting:
Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

11 May. 1858.

Suggest that Alexander be present at the Commission

Dear Mr. Herbert

This big parcel is only
Farr's tools.

Would you think
well to have Alexander
to help him at your
Meeting, as otherwise
Tulloch will bayonet
him with some
technicality, which
will delay business -
& which Alexander,
(who is always to the

front), might be able
easily to meet?

Alexander is at
home, 64 Ebury St.,
as I dare say you
know -

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

May 11/58

Signed note, 1f, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

Farr's Table
recalculated
upon Tulloch's

undated letter 2057/F4/67

Dear Mr. Herbert

It occurred to me
that, to convince the
Unbelieving, you might
require Farr's Table
re-calculated upon
Tulloch's, P. 31. I there=
fore enclose it, with
the fractional problem
stated for your Infidel,
but which you will
put in your own words.

F. Nightingale
Thursday mornng

[possibly this is where fragment should go]

P VIII

Some Note necessary
to explain difference
between Tulloch's Army
Numbers in this
Table & Farr's Army
Numbers in Table
in your M.S. (a)

Part of a document, undated fl, pen 2057/F4/67 written on back of folio in another handwriting [with above, needs alignment]

Miss Nightingale
 Cost of Nursing

<i>Sick</i>	<i>Attendants</i>	
(1) Ward for 9	----- 2 1/3	
3 "s " " = 27	----- 7 } viz	
	} Orderlies	
	} 6	
	} Nurses	
	} 1	
(2) Ward for 30	----- 4) viz	
	} Orderlies	
	} 3	
	} Nurses	
	} 1	
(1) Cost of 27 sick		
at £50 per ann	} 7 X 50 = £ 350	
per attendant		
(2) Cost of 30 sick	} 4 X 50 = £ 200	
Capitalized	} £ 350 = £ 8750	
at 25 years' purchase	} £ 200 = £ 5000	
Capitalized	} £ 8750 = £ 324.1.6	
cost per patient	27	
		} £ 5000 = £ 166.13.4
		30
Cost of nursing	} (1) £ 324000	
per 1000 sick	(2) 166000	
Difference	£ 158000	

Signed letter, ff4, pen, on back in another hand: May 29/58 2057/F4/67 Miss Nightingale O. Burrell Sanitary Commission {illeg} of O. Sutherland

May 29/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I was going to mention the enclosed to you the other day, in order to submit to you a scheme, but Sutherland was here & I was afraid he would hear.

You must have seen enough of Burrell by this time to see that, altho' the best

man we have, he is
absolutely incapable
of organizing &
initiating a new
Department -

Unless some man,
like Sutherland, who
would, I know, add
this work to that
he has already on
the Barrack & Hospital
Commission, were
called upon officially
to do it, (which also

would, while that
Commission lasts,
add the weight of
your authority into
the scale,) the
Regulations would,
believe me, be a
dead failure.

Burrell's ap=
pointment should
be made conditional
upon some such
measures as this -
And if he resists,

put in Cooper. But
he will not.

We have the estimate
& scheme of the new
Army Medical Board
nearly ready for you.
But there are some
vexed points which will
require your own
direct decision,
before you can
"instruct" Genl= Peel
with it.

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

1. The Sanitary Regulations, as they stand now, presuppose an amount of administrative experience in the Army Medical Council which absolutely does not exist.
2. The Army Medical Council will have to be *guided* in this matter until every Regulation is in full working order, & the whole

Service in a state of thorough completeness

3. It will take several years to do this for England, India & the Colonies
4. The transitional period will have to be got over just as it is in any other new Department
5. The Secretary of State for War would have to write a letter commissioning some competent

Sanitary person to organize & initiate the new Sanitary Department, & also to inform the new Director General that he had done so

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

232

October 2012

Signed note, undated, fl, pen Written on the back of a folio in another handwriting:

2057/F4/67

Miss Nightingale

Netley

I send you the third **[16:314]**
Article I wrote in the
"Builder" because it
contains the *canons* of
Hospital construction,
& is therefore more
suited to the practical
Cheetham than the
Liverpool papers
which contain only
its *defects* -
Moreover it is the
only one not out of
print -

F Nightingale
There are one or two

things in the Netley Appendix
you had which I
think we have rather
altered our minds
about. as concerns
at least a small
Hospital -

[end]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

233

October 2012

Signed letter, fl, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

May/58

on proposed

Medical

Board

Dear Mr. Herbert

For your interview
with Alexander, I
send \mp

No 1. Proposal after
hearing all that
Alexander & Farr
have to say

and amendments
on "Instructions" consequent

No 2. Alexander's
own proposal, his
last, nearly the same
as ours, & considerably
modified from his three
first.

Please let me see
all these again
when talking over
the matter with you

No 3. Smith's
proposal in your own
Report, modified
according to your
"Instructions" enclosed -

No 4. some
miscellaneous informa=
tion -

Present state of
Board & Smith's
proposed Board are
included on this & on
Alexander's Paper No 2
& ~~this No 4~~

F. Nightingale
May 31/58

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

234

October 2012

Signed note, 1f, pen Written on side of the folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

June 1.1858

on Sidney's

Letter to the

Treasury

I have made no suggestions, for I think it is *quite perfect* from your point of view.

May it only incline the hearts of the Treasury towards us!

F. Nightingale

June 1/58

Signed letter, ff2, pen Written in another handwriting next to the date:

June 1858 2057/F4/67

Miss Nightingale

Thomson's report

Netley

Transcriber's note: continuation of last sentence of letter onto 1st page: be a very suitable one - 2057/F4/67

F. Nightingale

June 5/58

Dr. Sutherland has stolen the enclosed for your benefit - a practice I learnt from the Army & taught him.

After having read this, I am at a loss to conceive how Thomason could have signed the approval of the site sent to Gen=l Peel, except upon a principle set forth by Dr. Menzies at

I once saw a letter
of his to Dr. Smith -
denying the want
of stores & addressing
as his evidence a
letter of Werford's
the Purveyor, petitioning
the Ambassador for
stores & saying that
the smallest contribution
would be acceptable.

Thomason's appears
to me a better Report

on your side than De
Witt's.

He shows a larger
amount of fresh water
in the Estuary than
you bargained for.
His mud is upon
the whole rather
worse than your
mud. And the only
practical difference
between you & him
is this - he considers
the mud healthy
though it is, might

be advantageously covered up - while you think it better, on the whole, to remove away from it.

In some Sanitary points, Thomason's is behind the existing knowledge - But it will certainly do us no harm.

Oh for a little common sense which would shew any body that a site which requires all these Analyses to clear, cannot

[at top of left]
be a very suitable one.

F. Nightingale

Unsigned letter, undated, ff2, pen, 2057/F4/67

I applied to Sir J. Liddell
to give me data for the period
after 1843. He cannot,
but will send approximate
data, if he can -

[16:247]

The result of my examination of his Blue Books up to 1843 is astounding. ((The Mortality is even lower than we thought. For, (*excluding* the unhealthy Stations,) while the highest mortality at a foreign

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Station is 11 per 1000-
that at the Home
Station is under 7 -
Now a ship is more
difficult to ventilate
than a Barrack -
What can make the
Mortality of our Guards
in Home Barracks
nearly 3 times as much?

These are quite
authentic & fair to use.
At the same time,
while abusing Tulloch

for his unfairness in
getting at his Results,
it would hardly be
right not to say that
these are almost as
bad.

Upon looking in
Tulloch's Blue Book
for what you pointed out to me, it is
obvious that his way
of calculation may
tell any way.

For, unless the
proportion is *constant*

between the Mean Force
of each period of two
different populations,
you may bring out
a perfectly identical
result - (by adding
the Deaths & dividing
by the number of periods) from
data which tell exactly
the other way, & vice
versa

[end]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

238

October 2012

Signed part of a letter, undated, f3, pen 2057/F4/67

one great comfort is
that there is nobody
at the War Department
who can understand
them - F.N.

This is the state of
the matter in regard
to the "Regulations".

The Statistical
Regulations & Instructions
have been gone over
with Dr. Farr, whom
I have asked to come
here tomorrow morning
for a final Revise.

Dr. Alexander has
gone over the whole
of the Regulations ~~with~~
~~a view of~~ making his

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
final working corrections

239

October 2012

The Diet Rolls are
now completed & are
in Mr. Drewry's hands
for final printing off
- after which they
can be sent to Gen^l
Peel, in answer to
Lord Harding's letter
to you.

Matters being thus,
would you prefer
authorizing the
"Regulations" being directly sent to press for
which they are now

ready with the
view of submitting
proofs to the
Regulations Comm^{ns}
in the course of (say)
two days? or would
you think it
necessary to meet
here for the
purpose of revising and authorizing
the few corrections,
before the Proof is
sent to press?

I do not think
the corrections involve
any of your principles,

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

240

October 2012

and it would just
depend upon your
own time.

If you wished
to have only the
formal Regulations=
Commission Meeting
before you go, I
would send the
things tomorrow morning to
Drewry, as soon as
Farr has seen them
finally.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Sunday night

Evils of the Present System

- I. Tendency to fritter away responsibility
- II. Delay

I. All this minuting does away with all responsibility.

It was devised to instruct the newly appointed Head of the Office in the details of which they were ignorant, but did not like to ask of those over whom they were.

System of minutes
does not draw out
all the points of a
case.

Minute put upon
a paper by A (asking
for decision) states
certain points - B &
C raise other points
to shew their acuteness -
A who knows the case

[Questions 3218 etc
bear on Minuting
System.
Sir J. Graham

which B & C do not,
has no opportunity of
answering B's & C's
points. If the decision
of the S. of S. Be
against, A time is
lost & the whole
paper has to be
brought ~~out~~ forward again
with A's reasons
against B & C.

Moreover A's

Responsibility is gone,
because he knows
beforehand that B
& C are going to
revise him.

==

Personal intercourse
Between the S. of S. &

The heads of Branches in all important matters
should be the rule,
instead of the
exception, as now -

II. Delay.
Delay is owing to the

Minuting System &
to the Registry

To get a paper from
the Bk Dep. to the
S. of S. & back with
his decision occupies
never less than *two*
& generally *four* days.
Registry.

Bk Dep. Never gets
a paper till the
day *after* it is
received & often not
for *three* days.

Then time is lost
by sending the paper
back to Registry
to have previous
papers annexed.

This takes two
or *three* days more.
Registry decides whether
the paper is to have
a green cover -
often decides WRONG.

When a really pressing
case is shewn -
[So Registry is S. of S.
virtually.]
Registry often mislays
the paper in its
custody - & when
asked for, send back
to ask *what*. from
the Letter Books of
the Dep=t

Each branch keeps
letters it *writes*, but
sends to the General
Registry (for custody)
the letters it *receives*.

[It always takes
more than a day
to get papers back
from Registry.]

And good Officials
act on their own
former replies in
their own Letter Books
rather than wait]

Concentration without
proper sub=division
is only confusion.

The excellence of a
Register depends upon
the Index. The excellence
of the Index upon
Subdivision &
Classification.

Without subdivision
the Head of Branches
cannot fix responsibility
on the Registrar.

Business of each
branch is distinct
enough to allow each
to have its own registry
& custody of papers.
[Their business is quite
as distinct from
each other as
C. in C.'s from them]

A paper always
relates *mainly* to
one branch even if

connected with another.
It should be kept in
the branch to which
it mainly relates &
be borne on the Registry
of the other branch
to shew where it is.

Replies should be
kept with letters
received.

All the registries
might be in one room,
but the distance would
probably make it
more convenient to
separate them. There
should be a Super=
intendent of Registration
top press uniformity.

[A list of all
letters received
might be kept with
a note of the branch
to which they belonged,
if judged necessary]

There is neither
responsibility nor
publicity -
neither economy nor
punctuality
in the present system.

should be framed
solely on the principle
of making Heads of
each Branch directly
responsible to S. of S.

===

--General principals
upon which duties
of each branch are
to be conducted
should be accurately
laid down

===

Questions of *principle*
Alone would have
To be submitted to
S. of S. for decision.
and, as a rule,
by *personal* intercourse
with S. of S.

===

Check No 1
Upon responsibility
Of each Head of
Branch

As a check upon
this responsibility,
the results of the
working of each Dep-
should be periodically

Brought before S of S.

To effect this, it
might be necessary
to establish a Dep=t
of Control or Audit -

Or this might be
done under *Under*
S. of S.; or under
Acc=t Gen=l; or each
branch might
exhibit it.

There should be
exhibited a Classified
analysis of the
Expenditure, shewing
under each necessary
heads, as Superintendence,
Housing &c
the cost incurred
per man maintained
or per article manufactured.
- the comparison being
carried on from year
to year.

This Analysis could hardly be made under the present system of Acct Genl's Dep. In framing a remodeled system of accounts (said to be much wanted) some first-rate City Accountant conversant with the management of large Public Companies should perhaps be Consulted. But whether this be done or no, it should be

==

Kept in mind that one of the objects to be attained is the exhibition of the *results* of the Expenditure.

This would shew the RESULTS of the expenditure & would lead to economy by shewing where saving might be effected.
[Well managed Railways (not many English!) shew cost per passenger or ton transported - divided under expences of management, maintenance of road, fuel consumed, repairs of engine & carriages stations &c &c etc
There is no reason Why the W.O. should Not make out its Expenditure to exhibit The results of its working]

==

Check No= 2
upon responsibility
Of each Head of Branch
Every *complaint*
should be brought
before the *S. of S* or
Under S. of S.

not dealt with
by Head of Branch
against whom it is
made.

Note. There appears to be no advantage
in the Minuting System for any matter
which concerns two or more branches.
Were the heads of such to meet, consult
together & come to a decision *before*
the matter is referred to the *S. of S.*,
or were they to meet in his presence,
the matter would probably occupy
as many minutes as it does now *days*.
If there was a reference needed to some branch
not under the same roof, (as the *A.M.D.*,) the papers
would be sent to him & an interview requested.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

248

October 2012

Signed note, fl, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

June 24th

1858

Asking for the
order of Copies
of Dr. Farr's
corrected Report

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dr. Farr sent in
his corrected Report
to be printed yesterday.
would you tell Drewry
to have it done as
soon as possible and
would you order the
number of copies
you think is fit?

We shall want
12 copies ourselves

to append to the
Regulations *for the*
Sake of the Forms
which are necessary
to explain the
Regulations.

Yrs sincerely

F Nightingale

June 24/58

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

249

October 2012

Initialed letter, ff3, pen Written upside down on last folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

June 30

1858

On the Netley

Report

June 30/58

Enclosed is the Netley
Report & Sutherland's
Protest - both of which

I must have back
by 10 o'clock in the
morning, please -

If you have time to
read them & to
criticize the Protest,
So much the better.

As to the Report,

I don't see what
a sensible Peel
(if there is such
a man) can have
to say to it - but
"this is not a
Report at all -
it does not
answer anything
in Mr. Herbert's
report - nor is
there anything

in it he can
answer - the best
thing I can do
is to ask *him*
to report now upon
their evidence"

F. Nightingale

Simon's quotation of
The authority of the
Quarantine Officer
at Southampton is
disgraceful - a

miserable little
official, whose
~~one~~ existence at all
is a disgrace to us.

F.N.

Signed letter, ff4, undated, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

Exam-n of

Mil-y Purveyors-

Civil Hospitals -

Dr. Farr -

{illeg}

Sutherland

Alexander

Sterks

to Cook at Fort Pitt

Dear Mr. Herbert

As you are going to

examine Purveyor=in=Chief

Robertson on Monday, I

would anxiously suggest

that you should also

examine the

House Governor, Mr. Hill

London Hospital

Superintendent, Dr. Steele

Guy's Hospital

Resident Medical Officers

[added in another hand] Treasurer & Whitfield &

Steward

St. Thomas' Hosp=l

Perhaps also other Treasurers.

All that you will "get"
out of the Military
Purveyors will be that
they think everything
admirable - altho'
Purveyor Pratt, Fort Pitt,
told me that he made
indents on the Barrack
Dep=t & never got any
thing - which he
desired me never to
tell, which is the reason
why I tell you -

I think the Purveying
of the Civil Hospitals
far from perfect, but

it is suggestive -

The only improvements
of Robertson, (who, you
will remember, did
not come out till
April/55 to Scutari),
upon poor old Wreford,
was a violent expenditure
& the relaxation of all
rules & discipline -

But the study of our
"Purveyor's Regulations" -
a model of that system
which consists in throwing
responsibility from one
man to another, till
the last throws it out
of window, is the only way

to judge. If you will
allow me, I would come
down to you on Sunday
about 5 o'clock, & go
over them with you -

I feel very strongly
as to the desirableness of making the
Purveyor's a mere Steward's
Department, whose
business shall be that
of merely keeping the
stores always full - and
of ~~to~~ separating the
Attendance Department
entirely from the Steward's
& putting everything, as

soon as it comes out of
store, under charge of
the Sup=t of Attendants,
the latter having, in
all ~~reason~~ practice, the only &
real care of it -
The Governor head over
all.

The present indiscipline
of Military discipline in
a Hospital is indescribable.
It is impossible for the
Medical Officers to look
after the attendants -

The Steward ought however
to look after the repairs
&c subject always to the

Governor -

I would, however, if
I were you, send down
three of my best men,
Sutherland (Sanitarily)
Alexander (for system)
Storks (for supply) to
look at Fort Pitt. One
inspection of the system
at work will tell more
than all the evidence -
As I have said, all
that you will get will
be that "everything
works admirably" -

Will you not examine
Dr. Farr *statistically*?
He would be your best
evidence - And would
you not desire him
before hand to draw up
a List of the questions
to be asked himself,
in order to bring out
the real thing?

Ever faithfully yours
Florence Nightingale
Friday night

No. 2
Netley

Vide Plan

The long ward for the 24 men is an administrative improvement, which might very well be carried out over the whole length of each side.

But it is not a *Sanitary* improvement

1. The surface area of the ward is too large in proportion to its height

The height of a ward should be *two-thirds* of the breadth -
Netley wards are 15 ft high -
- But 33 ft. from back to front.

There is no question but that, for the ward here proposed{?} you must have additional Height.

2. The distance between the windows is 6 or 7 feet too great for good natural ventilation - though if there were additional height, this would be compensated.

3. Excrescence No=3 *must* be lopped off -
4. Each of the smaller wards must have only 8 men - the number agreed to by the former Comm=n to atone for defective construction. 10 beds is inadmissible, and bring back the cubic space & average distance between the beds almost to our present heinous "Regulation Book" -
5. There is no room for more water closets in the Excrescences than exist in the original plan - Crowding, filth & foul air go together -
6. 12 ventilating shafts must be provided in the long ward, viz. one for every two beds - if it is approved.

7. Pulling down the partition-walls between wards *diminishes* ventilation. For these were provided with ventilating shafts. Now air ascends by the walls. Ventilating shafts in the ceiling away from walls do not act, therefore, so well as those in the angle between wall & ceiling.
8. Unquestionably, ~~therefore~~ the large ward could not be ventilated by ~~natural~~ doors & windows alone -
9. Insist upon all the fire-grates being MUCH larger - for the sake of ventilation -
10. With regard to the "excavation", the amount of light is not the only objection. For this might be increased by ground glass in all the upper parts of doors opening into it.

But the disciplinary disadvantage is greater than those not used to Military Hospitals can at all estimate, viz. of the number of doors & corners communicating with the wards & with the Nurse's room - *To see at once where every body is* is a first rule - or at least to know where he is, if you do not see him. The present construction of Netley has a great advantage, in this respect. [The swing door is less objectionable]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

255

October 2012

Signed letter, ff3, pen On last page written in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

On the Netley's

Remarks

I send 6 wet copies
of the Netley "Remarks",
with every correction
in. The only important
one is the note added,
P. 3.

Could you ask Mr.
Gladstone (or somebody)
to watch the thing
in the Ho.?

If Peel says what
you tell him, good :

we will hold our
tongues: if he does
not, could Mr.
Gladstone (or somebody)
move for these
"Remarks", with
your Letter to Peel,
which is necessary
as suggesting the
solution, and which
ought not to be
"private".

Unless the "Remarks"
become a public
document, we can
make no use of it,
in case Peel does
does not do what he
is bid.

And I mean to
devote my remaining
days to putting to
death Simon & the
7 Pundits. You
will see me
breaking out in

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

256

October 2012

the Daily News,
Examiner
Builder
Lancet
Medical Times

& all sorts of
unexpected places.

F Nightingale

July 10/58

Signed letter, ff2, pen 2057/F5/67

Dear Mr. Herbert

Enclosed is a
Proof of the "Regulations"
ready for the press - which,
as I mentioned in
my last note, has been
gone over by Farr,
Alexander & Sutherland.

If you thought
well to send it
to Drewry, with
a stringent order

to send it back
in two days, for
you then to have your
Commission to sit
upon it, it would
save time.

And it is
important that
the new Director
Gen=l should begin
administering with the
new Regulations &

not with the old
ones -

Yours sincerely
F Nightingale

June 21/58

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

257

October 2012

Draft of a proposed letter, ff9, pen, at least two handwritings
On back of folio not in FN's handwriting: (with comments by JS)
Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

July 9. 1858

Enclosing a Draft
Of a proposed
Letter to Genl. Peel
A Report of
Netley Committee

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dou you think
Gen=l Peel would say
in the Ho. (when the
Netley vote is brought
forward) that he
has received such
a proposal from you as
the one I enclose a
Draft of, & that
H.M. Gov=t has
accepted it?

We should then get
all we want -

Your object being,
not to fight them,
but 1. to get your foot
into Aldershot &
2. to save a few
of the poor "sequels",
If, with possession
of some of the "sequels" we
had a General Hospital
& a Medical School
at Aldershot, we
should do -

They have a grant
for Aldershot Hosp=l,
I believe, have they
not? It is in the
Estimates -
They must send you the Aldershot
plans.

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

July 9/58

Practically, I think
the eventual result
would be that all
the incipient
Consumptives from

home would be sent
to Netley and all
the "sequels" from
abroad to Aldershot.
And the Director=
Genl would be the
man to determine
this which
Alexander would do
in the most sensible
& satisfactory manner.

(SH) 49 B. Sq.
July 16
1858

[not FN:] My Dear Peel

[FN:] I enclose a Copy of
Remarks we have
thought it necessary
to draw up on the
Report of the Netley
Hospital Committee -
It appeared to us to
be necessary to send
you these Remarks
because, ~~in our opinion~~
~~you and {illeg}~~
~~to }illeg}~~
~~{illeg}~~ points
(1)

at issue (SH) between
them & us are lost sight of in (FN) ~~from~~ the
Report of the Netley
Committee. The case,
as regards Netley,
appears to stand as
follows:

1. the climate
will not be suitable
for ~~certain~~ those classes of
Invalids, ~~for whom~~
(SH) require (FN) a ~~more~~ bracing (SH) climate (FN) ~~one~~
~~will be necessary~~

2. not (SH) having drawn a distinction between a
Hospital and a depot for Invalids to which the
Committee attach great importance but
to its capabilities as a Hospital
and not solely as a depot (FN) having
considered the building
at Netley with relation

~~to its accommodation~~
~~solely for Invalids,~~
we are not called
upon to give any
opinion ~~per~~ of its
~~adaptation~~ fitness for such
a purpose.

~~But after the~~
~~favorable opinions~~
~~which have been~~
~~given, we may~~

3. both the
Commission & Committee
agree that it is not
suitable for a General

Hospital for sick,
to which a Medical
School is to be
attached & where
~~a~~ General Hospital
administration may be
(SH) practiced and (FN) learned.

4. it is understood
to be the intention
of Government to erect
a large Military
Hospital at Altershot
on a suitable plan -
One of these elements
it appears to me
that an arrangement

(SH) 2

(FN) might be framed
which would meet
all the requirements
of the case

as follows:

1. if ~~H.M.~~ the Gov=t is
satisfied (I am not]
that Netley is suited
for an Invalid Depot
let it be restricted
to that use, so far
as the local climate
is found to agree
with the cases, (SH) and let
the unused portion of it which in peace
will be very considerable be used as a
consumptive Hospital for which the Climate fits it.
(FN)2. Let the Hospital

at Aldershot be
proceeded with. We
have seen the plans
& think them, on the
whole, very good; -
with a few modifications
which we shall be
very glad to point
out, these plans can
be made suitable
for all the purposes
contemplated by the
R=l C=n.

3. let the Medical

School & its buildings
be attached to the
Aldershot Hospital -
This plan would have
the advantage of
bringing the candidates
into immediate
contact with
Regimental & Camp
duties. ~~Having we
examined into the
French Military
Medical School~~ we
should be ~~very~~ glad
to render any assistance

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
(SH) in the organization
(FN) ~~with the plans~~ of such
a school.

261

October 2012

4. there is only
one disadvantage
and that would be
the absence from
Aldershot of cases
of chronic disease
coming from abroad.
But such cases could
as easily be sent
to Aldershot from
any port of arrival
as to Netley - And
cases might even be
sent from Netley to
Aldershot.

An additional
advantage to the sick
would accrue from
this: For the climate
of Aldershot is the
very one to suit those
cases (SH) (especially {illeg} Indian-tropical) (FN) which that
of Netley would not
suit. By such an
arrangement as the
one proposed, the whole
question would, as
it appears to us,
receive the most
satisfactory solution
~~possible~~ (SH) of which it is capable. (FN) Government

might (if satisfied,
on the point) complete
Netley as an Invalid
Depot - Aldershot
Hospital could be
made suitable for
the objects required
by the R=1 Commission,
while it would
afford accommodation
for the Invalids,
~~with~~ for whom the climate of Netley
~~did not agree~~ (SH) is
likely to prove disadvantageous.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
(FN) These are, in fact, all
the points at issue
between the Gov=t & ~~the~~
~~Public~~ — and between
The Barrack & Hospital
Commission & the Netley
Committee.

262

October 2012

(SH) I make this proposal
for your consideration, as I
know your only object is the
furtherance of the public service
and the adaptation to the
most useful purpose of which
{illeg} found already done
at a great public out lay

and in this with
everything clear
I need not tell
you that I am
glad to give you
any assistance I
can.

Believe me
{illeg}

(FN)
Draft
of proposed
Letter to be
sent to Gen=l
Peel with a
Copy
of the Remarks
on Report of
Netley
Committee

Signed letter, ff2, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:
July 11/57. 2057/F4/67
Miss F. N.
On the Police
Returns

Dear Mr. Herbert

As to what you say
of the Police Returns, I
have to say the enclosed.
If you like me to give
it in evidence, I will.
But I think it would
be much better for Dr.
Sutherland to do so -
Because I have a kind
of nondescript reputation,
in dear John Bull's
imagination, like the
Unicorn or the Dodo

And he does not know
whether I am a
fabulous animal or
a real ~~sound~~ Sanitary
opinion, to be consulted
as to facts.

I could give you all
the Returns, on which
the enclosed are founded.

Please send me the
Evidence from p. 241

yours very faithfully
F. Nightingale

In regard to Promotion,
I send you a very curious
Diagram, which I should
like to explain.

I would come to you
tomorrow, if you have time.
July 11/57

Initialed copy of a document in FN's handwriting, undated 2057/F4/67

Copy

Wanted

1. The best India House map of India
2. The trigonometrical survey, as far
as completed
3. List of all Military Stations - to be
marked also on the maps.
4. Copies of all periodical reports of
Medical Boards in Presidencies
which have been published.
5. Copies of all published Army
(Indian) Statistical tables.
Same - Queen's troops
6. Lists of all places where there are
permanent Barracks & Hospitals
7. Access to catalogue of documents
at the India House & to all documents
there, bearing on the enquiry.

Note. The above data being obtained,
upon them might be constructed
Forms of Returns or printed questions
to be sent out to India, filled up
there & returned.

This should (?) be the construction of the Commission. This I have NOT sent to Lord Stanley

- Chairman - Mr. Herbert
- Sanitary - Dr. Sutherland
- Mr. Martin
- Medical - The Director General
- A.M.D.

Engineering & Topographical - (Indians)

Military (Indians)
Statistical Dr. Farr

I don't know what Mrs. Herbert will say to me for even "evening" of such a thing to you -

I hope you will give Gastein time -

FN.

Copy of unsigned document in FN's handwriting, undated, ff2, pen. 2057/F4/67

Copy

1. Altho' the subject of enquiry is in India, the enquiry itself would be best conducted in England & extended to India if necessary.

2. The best means of contorting such an enquiry would be by constituting a special Commission, composed of people, conversant with the various matters connected with the enquiry

- Sanitary
- Medical
- Engineering & Topographical
- Military
- Statistical

3. The Commission should have ample powers of obtaining information & documents. It should have access to all documents in the India Ho. relating to Topography

- Diseases & Mortality
- among the troops
- Supplies &c

of every district in India, where Military Stations have been or are likely to be placed. Likewise to all documents relating to Hospitals.

4. It should examine retired or acting Medical, Engineering & Military Officers, conversant with the stations in each of the Presidencies. It should enquire into the Sanitary condition of existing stations, with a view of recommending improvements. It should recommend improvements in existing Stations, Barracks & Hospitals & in the diet, drink, dress, duties & exercises

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
of soldiers.

266

October 2012

5. It should point out the best of positions for Sanatoria & the method of using them, so as to be most conducive to the health & efficiency of the troops.

6. It should enquire into the whole question of Hill Stations, & recommend the best positions available for troops in a Military & Sanitary point of view.

7. It should, further, indicate the special provisions necessary for Field Hospital & Field Sanitary Service, suitable to the different Presidencies.

8. Also, any specialties in the organization of General & Field Hospitals to make them more suitable for Indian Service.

9. Also, the organization of Medical Boards for regulating the Medical & Sanitary service in the Presidencies.

10. The Commission must have power to extend its enquiries to India & to appoint persons for the purpose, subject to the approval of the Minister.

Initialed document, ff5, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

20. Jan. 1858. 2057/F4/67

Miss Nightingale

Netley

Gt Malvern

Jan 20/58

The plan of Netley, with its wards for 9 sick, is by far the costliest for administration, v. the following facts-

1. It is proposed to provide the Hospital with Orderlies & Nurses to conduct the Nursing, in wards of 9 sick.

2. Wards may accommodate 25 - 30 sick - & the sick be better off, on Sanitary grounds, than with 9 - We may therefore choose the larger, being guided only by the cost of the Nursing.

- 3. A ward of 9 sick would require
 - 1 day Orderly
 - 1 Night "
 - 1 Nurse
 - 3

(i.e. a Nurse would Nurse 3 such wards)

4. Orderlies & Nurses cannot be counted at a cost of less than £ 50 per ann. including lodging,

rations, wages & not including pension. This, when capitalized at 3 per cent - (33 years' purchase) would amount to £ 1650 for each -

5. A ward of 9 sick would cost in Nursing £ 1650 X 2 1/3 = £3850 or £ 427.15.6 per bed

6. A ward of 30 sick would cost for Nursing in perpetuity £ 1650 X 4 = £ 6600 = £ 220 per bed

7. The cost of the two plans relatively for a Hospital of 1000 sick would stand thus

Wards with 9 beds = £ 427,775
 " " 30 " = 220,000

Capitalized difference of cost in favor of large wards } £ 207,775

Netley has cost already Land = £ 30,000
 Works = £ 89,000
 £ 119,000

It hence appears that, if works & site were both sacrificed & fresh land purchased, & wards for 30 sick built on it, the country would actually save the difference between the two sums of = £ 88,775

II.

But the best number of sick to a ward, for *Sanitary* purposes, is 25. The cost of attendance would then stand thus:

For each ward of 25 sick

3 Orderlies at £ 1650 = £ 4950

If two such wards are built in line, close to each other, with the Nurse's room between them, one Nurse could superintend

both wards or 1/2 Nurse = 825
£ 5775

Or cost for each bed 5775

25 = £ 231

Wards with 9 beds = £ 427,775

" " 25 " = £ 231,000

£ 196,775

Deduct cost of Netley {already incurred} 119,000

Saving from abandoning Netley £ 77,775

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Cost of administration per 1000
at Netley & Aldershot

270

October 2012

Netley £ 427,775
Aldershot

pavilions with 3 super=
imposed wards & 25 sick
in each would require
3 orderlies }
1 Nurse }to each Ward
& would cost £ 264 per bed
in perpetuity, or per 1000 sick

£ 264,000

Difference in cost £ 763,775
in favor of Aldershot}

As there are few wards,
with 16 or 18 sick, at
Netley, some abatement
of cost would have to be
made, on this account,
as regards Netley -

F.N.

Cost of Nursing

I will generously make Panmure
 a present of the difference of 1 per
 cent in cost of administration.
 But he will not be much the richer.

Wards of 9 beds { 2 Orderlies }		
{ 1/3 Nurse }	£ 50 per ann. each	
money at 4 per cent		
for 1000 sick	=	£ 324,000
Wards of 30 beds { 3 orderlies		
{ 1 Nurse }	per 1000 = £	166,000
Cost of Netley		119,000
Saved by abandoning		
Netley }	£	39,000

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Signed letter, ff4, pen {black-edged paper} 2057/F4/67

272

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St
Oct 4/58

[16:315-16]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dr. Sutherland is writing to you - And I think he will give you reasons why it is *not* essential to the progress of the business that you should be troubled to come up to town *just now* - All that is necessary can be sent down to you -

I am very sorry to trouble you either with the reply to Neison at this time.

~~{illeg illeg}~~ Nor do I think there is any great hurry about it. You can consider it later - But Farr & Sutherland met here this morning. And they concluded that two things were necessary
1. & least important -
-that Farr should make a Statistical indirect attack on Neison's figures at the Liverpool meeting - for which we have furnished him with Barrack & other data.
2. that some sort of official

reply should be made
by you, sent to the
different late Royal Commis=
ioners for their adhesion,
& a copy sent by
Balfour to the "Times"
for insertion, & another
to Owen, the President
of the British Association
Meeting at Leeds for
insertion into the Annual
Vol= of their Transactions
with Neison's paper.

I enclose what
Farr & Sutherland ~~suggest~~
~~for you to~~ for your reply - These are
merely heads & very
diffuse - If you, in
your own terse way,

could some time
write a Reply of this
kind (which Sutherland
tells me you think
is needed), it would
set the question at
rest - We would have it
put up in type -

Believe me

ever yours

F. Nightingale

Neison's paper reminds me
of Lardner's famous paper
which proved incontrovertibly
by figures that the "Great
Britain" could never cross
the Atlantic. The Bristol
people answered it by
sending her across the
Atlantic - And Neison's
paper will be answered by
your curing or at least diminishing
{written vertically in left margin of 1st folio}
Consumption in Barracks. **[end 16:316]**

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

274

October 2012

Signed note, ff2, pen Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

July 10/58

Enclosing Proof
of Letter on
the Regulations

Dr. Sutherland is at
the Office. So I opened
your letter to him.
He will, I believe,
bring back with him
here the Portsmouth
Report in question (*signed*), if
Galton, as well as
Burrell, is "to the fore".
And I will imme=
diately send it to you.

I enclose the Proof

of your letter on the
Regulations, only
premising that the
War Dep. do not
seem at all inclined
to pass anything
~~which~~ because they
cannot understand
it, & that therefore
leaving them in
ignorance has not
attained the object
in view.

Yrs sinclly

F Nightingale

July 10/58

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

275

October 2012

Signed note, undated 1f, pen, black-edged paper, Written on back of folio in another handwriting: [May 1858]

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

sends {illeg} fresh {?}

Memorial of Middl{illeg}

Hospital v. Netley

Monday

Dear Mr. Herbert

I think it my duty, (as the South Africans & the Ho. of Commons say), to send you the Draft of a Memorial, which the Middlesex Hospital - who have "gone & done it again", - sent in on Saturday to Gen^l Peel anent *Netley Hospital*.

F. Nightingale

Signed letter, ff4, pen Written on the back of a folio in another handwriting:

May/58 2057/F4/67

Miss Nightingale

Netley could

{illeg}

{illeg}

appointment of Dr.

Alexander {illeg}

{illeg}

30 Burlington St.

May 24/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

It is in the United Service Gazette (but as "news", not gazetted) that Smith is placed on the Retired List with £ 1200 a year & that Alexander is to be Director General.

With regard to this question of his appointment, what

would you think of
desiring (?) General Peel
to appoint Alexander
immediately, in order
to make sure of that
event, - which would
set a great many
obscene birds to flight
immediately from the
Army Medical Board,
where they have been
collecting there five
years - ~~But~~ Gen=l Peel

further to be *instructed*
(?) that you will not
be ready with all
your "Regulations" &c &c
for three months, (which
I am afraid, will be
the time necessary) &
that therefore Smith,
who cannot be turned
out neck & crop,
may hold his office
for that time, after
which Alexander &
Council will be ready
to move in bodily.

2. What would you
think of *instructing* (?)
Gen=l Peel to give you an
order upon H.M.'s
Stationary Office Spottiswood
printing upon your
own order, i.e. at
your own time? as
you are anxious to
present these things
to him within a
reasonable space of
time - and they are
not strictly what is called
"Secret" Printing. The

instruction to Drewry
is to print *secretly*
the practice is to
print *slowly**

3. Gen=l Peel has told
the Netley Committee to
send in their Report
to him on Thursday
to be ready for him
on Friday in the
Committee of Supply -
But they say they can't -
Babington, the oldest
of their Pundits thinks

* As the time (*three months*)
mentioned in No. 1 depends very
much upon the printing, it might
become, if you carry No. 2, six weeks.

Netley the "nicest"
thing he has seen -
both as to "site" and
construction".

I have asked Dr.
Sutherland to write
to you about this -

Believe me

sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

Chadwick has just been
here. He says he is very
busy about some
Manchester Sanitary
thing - he has engaged to

write for the N. British
for your Report - &
if Elwin does not
answer by Friday,
he should like to
write to him to with=
draw his Article for
the Quarterly, being
~~thus~~ much pressed for
time

F.N.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Signed letter, ff3, pen, black-edged paper 2057/F4/67

278

October 2012

May 21/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I scarcely know
whether it is worth
your while to look
over the enclosed
Farr's Report, in
which I have
written in pencil
all Balfour's
objections -

Balfour says that

he cannot get ready
before Saturday night
his Memorandum
for you on the subject
for you on the subject,
altho' it contains
nothing more than
this - & a few Forms,
which he wishes
to do himself -

I hope you will
then be so good as
to send them back
to us, for Farr's

consideration.

I think it is
well Balfour's objec=
tions are no worse -
He is come on
wonderfully in his
education this last
twelvemonth -

He & Tulloch
frighten one out of
one's wits with
their mysterious "It
won't do." One thinks

one is going to have
the Quadrature of the
Circle explained to
one in Sanskrit - &
to be obliged to
give in without a
struggle - And there
are only these few
innocent objections -
which Farr calls
"nice little amendments".
The real struggle will
be about the publication
of the Weekly State.
Please let me have
back *this* copy of Farr's
Report. Yours sincerely F. Nightingale

Signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/67

Great Malvern

Aug 4/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

Thank you very much
for your letter. I sent one to
you from Alexander, addressed
to Hamburg; which I hope
you had.

As to what you say
about the Indian Sanitary enquiry,
I entirely agree as to its
difficulty, but not as to its
impossibility.

1. I think it must be
conducted in England, because
in India there are not the
men (to do it)

2. I think there are only
a few men in England who
can do it ~~with any profit~~ so as to be of any use
because much of the informa=
tion which will have to be

obtained from India will be erroneous - or rather it will consist of opinions, not facts & ~~have~~ will have to be sifted by those who can sift.

The Netley enquiry is most alarming - not because we have lost Netley by it, though that is a great loss - but because it shews what ignorant or dishonest opinions can do - & what an amount of mistaken information is always at Government command.

The conclusions of the Netley Report & of almost all Sanitary Reports, existing, excepting yours, are like Mrs. Nickleby's, who, when she found that Cardinal Wolsey's & Defoe's fathers were butchers, supposed that there was something in the suet. There will be great danger in any Indian enquiry

of conclusions being offered to Government entailing perhaps an expenditure of half a million, like Netley, founded on something in the suet.

3. Again, I think this enquiry must be carried on, if undertaken at all, in something like the way your R. Sanitary Commission was, altho' I acknowledge the greater difficulty. Because you had, on that, some people whose conclusions were all ready made in their heads founded on experience of their own, which nothing could alter & nothing could take away from..

Still, had the India Bill passed before your R. Sanitary Commission sate you ~~it~~ would have necessarily had to include the Indian enquiry in it & it is only an extension & continuation of that Commission.

4. There are, I assure you, in England people from India who have *both* "livers" & "heads". And there is an immense deal of accumulated documentary evidence at the India House which if sifted by those who are capable, would give a great deal of information not open to the objection which would attach to the information received at home from an enquiry instituted in India, which would transmit home opinions, not facts.

At the same time, this Commission if Commission there be, must have power to institute enquiries of its own in India - And the most valuable part of this information would probably be derived from Forms of Returns which it would itself construct & send out, to be returned to it filled up.

2

But these must be read by people who are capable of reading them.

I have just seen an instance of the reverse.

I have just seen Burrell's Notes on the S. Eastern Barracks enclosing ~~the~~ Returns filled up, Galton's Notes, who had not seen the Returns, & Sutherland's. Burrell has written his, as if he had not seen the Return - And nevertheless the ~~facts~~ readings from these will make the most important part of the South Eastern Inspections Report.

To sum up -

I think

1. that the enquiry as to Indian Sanitary things must be instituted in England & by a Commission
2. that this must consist of a few men of great experience in this way, or it had better not sit at all
3. that it must follow much the course of the former R. Sanitary Commission
4. that it must have power to institute enquiries & to issue Circulars of printed Questions to be filled up in India

I assure you that I
have not been so good
as to offer your services
to Lord Stanley - which
I am afraid you will
think I have -

But I enclose copies
of suggestions I have
made to him this day.
[I had a second letter from him saying "only
show me how we are
to set to work," & offering
& asking for "information".]

My belief is that, if
he has a Commission
with any other Chairman,
he will ~~make~~ bring together a great
mass of blunders instead

~~of~~ of information - as
the Commission for the
Indian Army is, as you
say, a blunder - You call Hawes
an "inconvenient little
dolt." But that Commiss=
will prove an
inconvenient large dolt.

Believe me, I do not
even wish, much less
hope, that you will
undertake this. I only
think Lord Stanley
had better let it alone,
if you don't.
Pray excuse, dear
Mr. Herbert, what may
seem impertinent to you
in this I did not mean
to be impertinent - & believe
me yours sincerely F. Nightingale

30 Old Burlington St.
Sept. 15/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

As I dare say you are only going through London to one of Your "numerous seats", (the expression is a borrowed one from Mr. S.C. Hale) I am just going to make you a *Compte Rendu* - & have done

I did not come up to town to intercept you - I did not indeed. I came up on the 4th, because Lord Stanley himself fixed that time (of his being crowned head of the Indian Council) to turn his mind to the Sanitary matters, & he now very naturally finds he has too much to do, & adjourns it

- I. 1. Gen=ls Peel & Storcks are gone out out of town this morning to Plymouth on an Expecting Expedition -
2. Your Barrack Commission is gone to Ireland only today (Galton was detained on B. of Trade business till today), will do the S. of Ireland only, & will be back in 12 days - about -

3. I enclose *their* business first

1. *Woolwich Report*

This has been corrected by themselves & awaits your consideration - Some of the Woolwich Estimates have been obtained (for Ventilation of Barrack Rooms only) & sent in - to the amount of about £ 3000 The improvements begun. The other not yet come in - will be about £ 10,000 altogether, - independent of accommodation.

2. Chatham Report

corrected as sent in. A part of the Estimates (for ventilation of Barracks & drainage of Fort Pitt only) have been obtained & sent in to the amount of about £ 5000 - some of the work begun - The Estimates altogether will be about £12000, independent of accommodation But none other of the Estimates than the above are yet to come in.

3. South Eastern Report

First Proof enclosed - not yet considered even by your Commissioners. Estimates not yet received from the Command=g R. Engineers - will be something quite enormous - it is so bad -

4. Portsmouth & Winchester Report

corrected as sent in. Estimates & all NB *Woolwich & Chatham* are the only ones for your consideration, therefore

I do not enclose

1. *Maidstone Report* - in printer's hands. Estimates not yet come in from Comm=g R. E.

2. *Manchester, Bury, Ashton Stockport, Preston, &c Report* - in printer's hands - Estimates will be very trifling- perhaps not above £3000 altogether

3. "General Orders" as to improvements, in preparation concerning 1. ventilation - size of apertures &c

2. drainage etc

3. lavatories & how to make them

4. kitchens & what to have in them -

for all Barracks -

~~The~~ Gen=ls Peel & Storcks have been hard at work inspecting Barracks, (taking the bread out of your mouths, in fact) & very much to their surprise as to results.

They have been at Dover, Chatham, Portsmouth, & do Plymouth to day. They say that two millions will be required to complete the Barrack reforms, including Hospitals - But that they will get the money.

I think the danger will be (not that they will not be foreword enough but) that they will take "leaps in the dark" & do ignorant things, if you are not Dictator to them.

Mennie is consulted about every thing, & with his 25 years' traditions of the R. Engineers Dep=t, does many foolish things, besides Netley. (2)

II. About Alexander's affairs - I hope you will see him before long & he will then tell you himself -

1. The *Warrant* is not yet out
2. *Medical School*

Regulations

might be advantageously inquired about -

Of the *Regulations* he has not heard a word - And you will remember that you desired Gen=1 Peel to refer them to him. I don't believe they have even been looked at - Of the *Medical School* he has - It has been referred to him. And he has written an excellent letter about it.

So has the *Warrant*. It was sent back to him, with "*improvements*" (?) And he wrote a first rate letter about it. He thinks it is safe

But it is not out as I understand.

You ought to see his two letters on these two subjects.

I don't think you at all over-rated the use Alexander would be of. He is determined to carry out the *spirit* of the R. Commission & he is doing it with great judgment. I should think the War Dep. had never received two such letters before - They amount to a censure, without being in the least impertinent - Certainly old Andrew never told them anything of the kind. The letters & minutes I have seen from the ~~War~~ Officials (of Alexander's position) in the War Dep. would do, with the alteration of a word or two, to put in "Punch". Have you seen Punch's "Scentral Board"? {sm.caps on S of Scentral}

I wish those Regulations, though, could be *heard of*. It is like the

search after poor Franklin.

4. They have been "adding insult to injury", as the parrot said when he was made to learn English, for, after having crammed Netley down our throats, they have referred it to Alexander to organize - an unorganizable place - I think this has been done as little badly as it can be done.

III. About the Indian matter, I think it is "as well as can be expected"-

[9:68]

Since you were so very good as to say that you would undertake the matter, the chief fear has been that Lord Stanley would say his "Organization" Commission could do it. He is however convinced 1. that it has neither men nor "Instructions" to touch it at all. "The best means

of securing the efficiency "of troops raised for Indian service - is the only sentence in their Instructions which can be construed to mean Sanitary Reform at all. And Lord Stanley says it does *not*. I am glad of it.

2. he is convinced that the subject *ought* to be dealt with & "separately" & "fully" & "urgently". These are all his own words. He says he cannot do any thing *directly*. But I do not think he will do anything without consulting you - And that is the main matter - And as he will do no mischief, which is satisfactory, I hope in a few weeks he will be able to do good.

He has not "committed" himself to any thing either way.

(3)

I am going to Malvern tonight, because I know, if I were to stay, I could not keep my hands off tormenting you -

But I hope you will be so very good as to let me know when you come to town - I suppose you may perhaps be "looking up" the creatures in a fortnight's time? Please don't deceive me. Because it is nothing to me to come up -

[end 9:68]

I hope you are quite well

Believe me

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{on back of last folio, not FN's hand:

Miss Nightingale

Sept. 15. 1858

Containing

Woolwich Report

Chatham Report

Portsmouth & Winchester

& South Eastern Reports etc.

Also

Inspection of Barracks

by

Genls Peel & Storks

Gt Malvern
Sept 23/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have had (not
a letter but) a volume
from Sir J. Clark
about the Army
Medical School. I
don't think there is
anything in his letter
new to you or different
from your own opinion.
And therefore I only
send you an Abstract
of it.

I think he must

exaggerate Alexander's
opposition - as we
have always found
him so very reason=
able - And I have
seen him since he
saw Sir Jas Clark.
All the rest that
Sir J. Clark says
is very true & what
we have always thought.
There can be no harm
in Sir Jas= Clark
poking Gen=l Peel, I

suppose, nor perhaps
much good.

If you wish to
suggest or alter any
thing, perhaps you
would write yourself
to tell Sir Jas= Clark
at Balmoral.

I have simply
written, saying that,
as far as I knew,
you would agree
with all his views.

Yrs sincerely

F. Nightingale

{on back of last folio in another hand:

Miss Nightingale

Sept. 3. 1858

Enclosed a Letter from Sir J. Clarke about the Army Medical School}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66 291
Initialed note, 1f, pen, black-edged paper, 2057/F4/67

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St
Oct 5/58

Dear Mr Herbert

I send you the Leader [16:316]
with Guy's answer to
Neison. It is good -
much what we
would have said
ourselves - if taken
not on the Statistical
but on the Sanitary
ground - It will
bring Neison out -
And there will be
a "row" - Yrs sincerely
F.N.

The Barrack Commission

are in their vanity
very angry. Because
all the Military
Newspapers attribute
your excellent system
of Ventilation to
Gen=l Peel

[end 16:316]

F.N.

{not FN's hand, written on back of folio:
Miss Nightingale Oct 5 1858
on Neison's paper on
density} of population} &
it's fallacious

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Initialed letter, ff7, pen, black-edged paper, 2057/F4/67

292

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St
Oct 6/48 [yes it is 48]

Dear Mr. Herbert [16:316-17]

Neison has not
only made the mistake
you mention in your
note, viz. of estimating
the population of the
great city of Wilton
as extending over
a large area of
Salisbury Plain -
But he has confounded
together *surface* over
crowding & over crowding

in *cubic space*, which
are quite distinct
things. E.g. the Metropo=
litan Model Lodging=
houses exhibit a larger
amount of surface
over crowding than
perhaps any part of
the Metropolis - But
they have a much
larger amount of
cubic space than
the working classes
usually have - And
they are well ventilated
& otherwise rendered

healthy. Hence, in
spite of their surface
overcrowding, they are
the most healthy part
of the Metropolis -

Neison's whole
enquiry is simply
a stupidity & nothing
more - But he has
some countenance
for it in the fact
that the Reg. Gen.'s
densities of population
refer (not to inhabited
areas but) to empirical
boundaries of all
kinds - To correct

Neison thoroughly therefore,
it would be necessary
to shew that the Reg.
Gen.'s method of
estimating densities
was incorrect.

If you think it
necessary to take this
line in the Reply,
we had better consult
Farr, & get him to
give an explanation.
We have been going
into the Barrack part
of it to which you
allude - And we find

on a superficial examin=
ation

1. that the largest
surface area in Barracks
is possessed by the
Cavalry & Household
Cavalry

2. that the Infantry
are somewhat more
crowded on square
area

3. that the Guards
are most crowded
of all

As regards cubic space
we find

1. that the Cavalry

have much the largest
amount

2. that the Infantry
come next in order

3. that the Guards
have least cubic space
of all

Next, as to the
external ventilation
of Barracks, we find

1. that the Barracks
of the Cavalry

Household Cavalry

Infantry

are generally free
from surrounding

buildings - & mostly
in the open country -
thereby exposing
them to the free
action of wind

2. that the Guards
Barracks are so
constructed & situated
as to be extremely
deficient in external
ventilation -

Lastly, that the
existing ventilating
arrangements of
Barrack rooms are
very nearly equally

deficient in all arms
of the Service.

We have not as yet
accurate Statistical
data - But if you
think it necessary,
they can be obtained
from the Returns -

In regard to the
Reply, you will see
by the "Leader" sent
yesterday that Dr. Guy
has confuted Neison
generally. Perhaps you
would think it
better to wait till
we see if Neison

replies to Guy - which
he probably will -
And then Your Reply
will be the more
victorious -

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Dr. Balfour has just
been here & says that
he was requested by
the Editor of the Medical
Times to write a leader
for next Saturday in
reply to Neison. He
has done so & sent
it in. From what he
says he has taken very

much the same argument as Guy - only he has shewn up Neison more completely from his better knowledge of what the Commission really said. I will send it you - [It is of course *unofficial*]

Balfour says that the Warrant is gone to Balmoral for signature & will be gazetted in about 10 days - that they have made some alterations not of great importance - They have cut out the

[end 16:317]

full pay retirements - which, as being intended to meet special cases, they say should be specially provided for when the cases occur -

There is only one scale of pay instead of two - And they have extended the period of service of the Deputy & Inspector from 25 to 30 years - giving an increase of retirements of *2/6 per diem* after 25 years' service.

These are the chief alterations - And upon the whole Alexander is satisfied.

F.N.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Signed letter, ff8, pen, black-edged paper, 2057/F4/67

296

October 2012

30 O. Burlington St
Oct 8/58

[16:318-19]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Surface density has
nothing to do *per se*
with disease - but
the conditions to which
density gives rise.
Distinguishing surface
density from density
in cubic space, the
surface density of
towns is not known,
in itself, to exercise
any influence whatever

upon health - But
wherever there is
surface density there
are in unimproved
towns Sanitary
defects which give
to surface density
its power of producing
disease - defective
cleansing, drainage, &c -
Even Neison assumes
(what is contrary to
fact) that, in towns
of all densities, these
defects are to the same
amount - Thus just as

the effect of overcrowding depends within limits on defective ventilation, the effect of Surface density depends on the accompanying Sanitary conditions.

No correct Vital Statistician would ever adduce surface overcrowding on overcrowding in cubic space as *per se* forming an element in his calculations -

It is consistent with experience that two-storied houses may be

so crowded as to give a higher surface density than that of five or six storied houses - Into such a comparison, the width of streets is not made to enter.

We can get out accurately the Statistics of overcrowding in the Guards - The Barrack Returns in the R. Comm-Report ~~by~~ (imperfect as they are,) shew that the overcrowding is greatest in the Guards - In cubic space - And the numbers

2

of Barrack flats shews that the density is also greatest in surface. The Barracks at Chatham are only occupied about 6 weeks by the same men. They don't, like the other Barracks, enter into the system of rotation.

The Infantry Barracks, hitherto examined by the Barracks Commission, comprise the most overcrowded in the U.K. The average space in the Irish

Infantry Barracks is much larger. Until the average is corrected for the Irish Barracks, we cannot get the proportionate over crowding for the Infantry generally - With this proviso, ~~they find~~ the deficiency of accommodation at 600 cubic ft per man ~~to~~ stands as follows:

Household Calvary +7 per ct
Infantry Barracks}
excluding Chatham}

-- 25 per cent

Foot Guards -- 26 per cent

so that, ~~even excluding~~
exclusive of

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Chatham, but including
all the other worst
Barracks, (which are
the S. Eastern ones), the
Infantry are still 1
per cent better off than
the Guards - *all* the
Guards' Barracks being
taken & *not* the best
Infantry Barracks -

We are however going
to ascertain the amount
of cubic space in the
3 classes of Barracks
accurately - & will
send it you

The Warrant has been
signed at Balmoral
& will be in print
tomorrow -

The Regulations have
traveled *as far as*
Robertson (Purveyor
in Chief) at the War
Office - There they have
stuck - He "can't under=
stand them at all."
To us it sounds like
finding out where the
hitch is in the Atlantic
Telegraph = But I am
not sure that the

3
bottom of the Atlantic
is not a less hopeless
place than the
bottom of the W.O.

The Diet Tables
have also stuck,
in the same manner
& at the same place.

The Council has
stuck, but *not* at
the same place - They
will let us have the Officers
but not as Councilors.
This will not do -

[end 16:319]

They have notified
that the Medical School

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
is not to be at Netley.

300

October 2012

One of Alexander's
best men, Muir, has
been appointed
Sanitary Officer at
Bombay. He reports
to his Chief that
the Sanitary abominations
there are quite enough
to account f
or our
Mortality.

[9:68]

The same at Calcutta -
I had a note
from Lord Stanley this
morning - But not a
word about the
Commission. The wretch
is at Knowsley. How
dare he be at
Knowsley? Is he
persuading his Papa?

[end 9:68]

I have seen Alexander,
who seems to hold his
ground well - The
Atlantic information
comes from him.

ever yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

301

October 2012

Signed letter, ff8, pen, black-edged paper, on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

Oct. 11. 1858

Sending her

book on

Nursing

30 Old Burlington St

Oct 11/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

I send you a thing about Nursing which I wrote, fearing that I might never again be able to give personal active help in Military or in Civil Nursing. It is very imperfect - And a Manual about Nursing is in

an impossible itself ~~a useless~~ thing - But it may give some Cautions to the Superintendent of Military Nurses, if such there be, & to her of the "Fund" Nurses, when they exist - in matters of organization -

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

302

October 2012

Signed letter, with above, ff?, no date, black-edged paper In another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

Contagion

[16:308-09]

Army Medical Contagion

Your *Canterbury* Report is gone in - but none too soon - Fever had broken out in the Barracks - In a very proper Report, the Medical Officer referred it to the right (& very obvious) local cause viz. the abominable drainage.

The Deputy Inspector, *Mouat*, comes over,

& to please the Commandg Officer, refers it to "*Contagion*"! "The men had caught it in the town"!! But, with marvellous inconsistency, he recommended an improvement in the drainage.

Why so? *either* let us have *Contagion* & *Cordons*, -- or *Local Causes* & *Sanitary improvements*.

The whole matter was referred to your Commission -

And very sharp I should have pulled up Mr. *Mouat*, if I had been *Sanitary Councilor* (in the future office).

I know that Dr. *Sutherland* has told you all this & the *Croydon* business. But could you not say something about it

(in your own pointed way) in your Article, to the effect that, had logic prevailed, Canterbury Barracks would have put Canterbury town under Quarantine, & Croydon Barracks, would themselves have been put under Quarantine by the Croydon town - But fortunately common sense stepped in, & saved us from the effects of logic, & from such a catastrophe

3

in the unimproved Scutari Hospital to have been (proportionately) double what it was in the Regimental tents of the Crimea exposed to every kind of want & hardship. And this is surely enough -

So much for the General question - But now that "Anonymous" has started this particular

point, I mean to set to work tomorrow with Smith's big Blue Books & work out (by the process of exhaustion) taking Smyrna, Abydos & all of the Hospitals, *how much* the Total Deaths, now stated to the Ho= of Commons, exceeded month by month *all & each* of the conflicting Statistics

which Anonymous
states to be
exaggerations &
which are really
understatements
of the truth -

If you do write
a Note upon any
of these subjects
in your Article,
please let me see
it before it goes
to press. I think,
if you notice the

Guards' attack & its
result, (not forgetting
the man who died
of "old age" at 60)
this pamphlet might
form a suitable
pendant - in a
Note-

[end 16:309]

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Hall has written to
Alexander to recommend
him Hall as one of H.M.'s
"Honorary Surgeons"!!

Unsigned letter, pen In another handwriting at top of the page:

Miss Nightingale

Oct 24/58

APPENDIX LXXIX

Dear Mr. Herbert

I don't know whether
you will think it wise
to look back to the old
Crimean story -

But the height of
absurdity in that
Correspondence (of
App. LXXIX of your
Report) has never
been surpassed. You
might treat it a
la Rabelais in your

Article -

What was the
practical result of all
that bulk of letters?
The sending out of
Lime Juice, which was
not distributed till
too late, & of Peat Charcoal
which was not wanted.

This was all -

What can one say -
More in condemnation
of a Department?

What was it there
for?

There is nothing in
Molière to compare with

this.

Lord Raglan was the
primary cause of Smith's
appointment - Never
perhaps was a more
fatal act committed
by a more honest
man. It cost him
his Army & his
reputation -

If you, as an
administrator, were
to touch it up, as
you well know how,
so as to extract the
ha'porth of bread out

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
of all that abominable
deal of suck, I think
it might do good. It
is Weston all over - [?]

306

October 2012

The good advice,
whenever the advice
is good, always comes
a month too late.

And the kernel of
those 212 (double column)
pages is ---- what?

If you want an
Abstract, that, (which
you have seen already)
is a faithful one, Preface
& Appendices to Section I
Preface to Section III, Preface
to Section X, Part 2, in my big Vol=
Signed note, fl, pen, black-edged paper, In another handwriting on back of a
folio:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67
14 Oct 1858
Sent with the
Warrant

Signed & sealed
Here comes the Warrant,
without any change
to negative it, & with
a sentence at the
beginning satisfactory
as admitting from
the Head of the State
that you were right -
It takes force, you
will see, from the
1st of this month -

Please return it
to Alexander, who has

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
no copy.

307

October 2012

The Medical School
is NOT gone in to the
Treasury.

Storks, Hawes &
Godley are to "sit
upon" the Regulations
& Army Medical
Council after this
week - & I believe
upon the School also

F Nightingale
Oct 14/58

Signed letter, ff5, pen, black-edged paper,
on back of folio: 2057/F4/67

Miss Nightingale
25. Oct. 1858.

on Neison's
Fallacy

30 O B S

Oct 25/58

[16:319-20]

1. I *am* glad you did
not answer Neison -
because now we
shall have all his
say out, & be able
to answer it in a
lump-

Neison believes
man to be solely
influenced by what
he *does*. He is quite
guiltless of all Phy=
siological, Climate, or

sanitary knowledge - was
himself a working man
& thinks work the
only element in our
lives & healths -

2. *The Pamphlet*
which Neison asks
after *is* the Pamphlet
I sent you last night.

3. *The Guards are*
about to build a
General Hospital
for the three Regiments

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

308

October 2012

on the site of one of
their Regimental Hospitals
in ~~the~~ Westminster -
Nothing is settled yet.
They would be very
glad to receive
hints, *provided* they
may have all the
credit of them, (which
you have no objection
to,) & provided they
are not lectured
officially - We were
only waiting for you
to come home to

ask you to ask them
to put the plans
onto your hands -
when, if you would
send them to us,
Sutherland & I
would do our best -
They are quite incapable
of doing it themselves.
But it must not be *official*.

4. I have gone thro'
all the figures in
Smith's Blue Big
Book today. And
the result is simply

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
this - (a result which
I must say has
astonished even my old
mind) -

309

October 2012

In the 6 months
Oct/54 to Mar/55 there
are 735 Deaths -
(unaccounted for -
not included in
any of the Medical
Mortality Statistics
which have yet
been presented to
Parliament -) which

which agrees (within 2) with
what Smith says himself

Smith - regardless of
exposure, as it
seems,- has plastered
on with a trowel
upon those 6 months
thus: Oct 211

Nov	9
Dec	151
Jan	239
Feb	122
Mar	3
	735

upon Scutari & Sick
Transport promiscuously

This, if calculated
into the Rate of Mortality
will raise it consi=
derably above what
Farr calculated & the
"Anonymous" complains
of.

I must say I feel
inclined to do it -
heart=sick as I
am of the subject -
if you feel inclined
to put a Note to
your Article

Yours sincerely,
F Nightingale

Further, the "Anonyous"
has taken the Head
Roll of Burials from February which
I stated expressly to
be for Scutari *alone*,
& substituted it for
the Medical Returns
which are for Scutari
& Koulali (the most
unhealthy of all the
Hospitals) together,
See P. 362

& P 391, Table IV

Rep. R. Commiss=n
add the Koulali deaths to the Burials at Scutari
and, so far ~~therefore~~ from
the Mortality having been
over=stated it has been
under=stated by 124 Deaths **[end 16:320]**

Signed letter, ff3, pen, black-edged paper, all 3 pages, 2057/F4/67
on back of folio:
Miss Nightingale
5.Nov.1858
article in
West Rev
Aldershot Statistics
Anonymous writing

Burl. St.
5/11/58

Dear Mr. Herbert **[16:320-23]**

There are 73,000
letters in 32 pages of
West Rev. type - and
54 000 letters in what
you have written already
or about 24 pages of Westm Rev.
(I assure you I have
not done this by
counting like a
"learned pig") The
consequence I am very
sorry for - We do not

find any "Medical heresies", or anything which require re=con=sideration, except Mr. Chapman's space-

If we could see the whole at once, I think we should be able to consider better what must be left in & what cut out. As it is, I incline to resuming about 20 (written) pages of controversy with Neison

into 3 or 4, & curtailing the rest as little as possible - I wish we could see the second half - before suggesting any curtailment in this however.

We have got the Aldershot Statistics from Alexander. They are very favorable & (when calculated) may be inserted in this Article, we think, with good effect as an illustration. Mortality from Phthisis about 2 per 1000 only -

I have taken advantage of your condemnation of anonymous newspaper=writing to indulge in an unrestrained course of the same of a vicious nature - As it is only in the Builders however I am not incurably outrageous. I shall send you the course = [They attacked us on Contagion]

I *did* not agree with you about anonymous writing - But the Times

has put itself so
completely in the
wrong that I think
most people will
agree with you now.
However the Times
never can give up
anonymous writing -
In a mere mercantile
speculation, which
such a paper is,
how could it?

[end]

Believe me

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Signed letter, ff5, pen, black-edged paper, all pages,
on back of folio in another handwriting: 2057/F4/67

Miss Nightingale

10.Nov.1858

"B.A." Surgeons

do not require

further exam?

presses for the

Statistical returns

Bad Plans for

Malta Hospitals

30 Old Burlington

10/11/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

1. I think, if you
could write all you
have to say & then
see what room Chapman
has, it would be well.
Some of the subjects
you enumerate are
so much more impor=
tant even than
ventilation - I still

think, if something
must be abridged,
it had better be the
Neison controversy -
I have written an
abrégé of some 20
of your (written)
pages from your approval,
trying to shew up his
statistical blunders
& strengthen the
statistical case for
the Army Med. Council

2. I like Brodie's
B.A. idea & yet quite
agree with what you
say - Could there not
be a supplementary
Warrant (or something)
saying that a man
who is a **B.A.** may
pass Surgeon (from
Asistant - Surgeon)
without the additional
Examination you have
(justly) exacted in your

Warrant? I think the
B.A. (General) education
quite an equivalent
to the (special) Medical
examination - Of the
20 Surgeons gazetted
today as Surgeons Majors
I am quite certain
there is not one who
is or could be a **B.A.**
But the Civil profession
is so enchanted with
the Warrant - it looks
upon it as such a

2.

prize for the Medical profession - that there will be little difficulty in future of getting

B.A.s

3. I do so wish the Statistical Forms could be out for the New Year - Would not Gen=1 Peel let the Statistical Scheme begin with Jan 1/59 - If so, he must be quick.

4. Malta is to have a new General Hospital for 500. Plans have been granted for 300. They are come to England for approval - Mennie has them in his hands. Burrell has seen them. He says they are atrocious. They must be bad indeed, if my old Burrell says so - It is eminently legitimate for you to

[16:324]

ask for them, because you have recommended a General Hospital at Malta. Both Burrell, Sutherland & I are well acquainted with the intended locality at Malta - Would not you ask for these pestilential plans to be submitted to you?

[end 16:324]

5. Sir James Clark was here today, hunting about for a President= (M.P..) for the new Medical

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Council. They want to
have you. I suggested
Headlam, Wm Cowper,
Ld. Elcho, Shaftesbury,
G. Hardy. I don't
want them to have
you. It's nothing but
a Registration Council,
for the prosecution of
interlopers. I think
doctors are like
insects, of no earthly
use but to be killed -
In medicine I think

315

October 2012

3.

the State is like the
Confession, doing every
thing it ought not to do
& nothing it ought
to do. It does not
prevent us from
being poisoned - But
it gives to certain
Schools the right to
poison us - I think
you would have to
give a great deal
of time to do a very
little good - as President
of that Council. They want
you, because they want the

"prestige" of a great man -

6. I do wish Gen=l
Peel would give us
some of our things now.
We have not been
troublesome. The
Regulations have been
"in" since July. Could
he not give us one
of our "little ones"?

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

316

October 2012

Signed letter, ff2, pen, written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

24.Dec.1858.

on the subordinates

of the W. O.

reporting upon

the Chiefs

30 Burl St

Dec 24/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

What original
ways the War Office
has - a remark, not
new but true - If

Anything ~~could~~ were wanting to convince
one that it wants
clearing out entirely,
I think it is this -

To put a set of
subordinates to report
upon the doings of
their immediate

chiefs seems the
method of doing
business in that
Department

Thus:

Mr. Herbert

Sir R. Airey..... Belfield

Mr. Alexander Beatson

Dr. Sutherland

Mr. Croomes Milton & Robertson

are appointed subordinates

to draw up in the same

the Regulations office, are

appointed

to report

upon said

Regulations

They have adjourned

themselves

till 10th Jan

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
A Military Officer is
is then to be joined to
them - & they are
to report all over
again -

What does the
War Office expect
to come at by this?

Laffan is still
ill & does not
return till March.

Galton says
the Medical School
buildings will not
cost above £ 1000
& might be ready
in 2 months.

I think I have
achieved a great
victory in convincing
Balfour of the superiority
of taking the
Constantly Sick
instead of the
Admissions - He
promises (but
"promises are like
pie crust") that
he will give me
these for at least
the Bengal Stations
in *classes* of disease

Your sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

318

October 2012

Signed letter, ff5, pen, Written on back of folio in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

27. Dec. 1858

Indian Sanitary

Commission

30 Old Burlington St.

London W

Dec 27/58

Dear Mr. Herbert

On Friday I took
my courage by the
fore lock & wrote to
Lord Stanley to ask
him to come & see
me - The reason of
my doing this wild
act was that I
thought, if it failed,
it would only pass
for a foolish woman's
love of being busy,

& if it succeeded it
would succeed - I
took care to let
Lord Stanley know
when he came that
you were not particeps

He came today -
There are so many
things that both he
& I could say which
it would not be
fair upon him to
ask him to write
& which it would
not be fair upon you
to ask me to write.

Bref, he says he will write to you *directly* to ask you to be Chairman & to select your own tools.

I confine my eloquence or my stupidity to these three points -

I confine my reasons to merely showing him an Indian map which I have now completed with the mortality of Queen's & E. I. C. troops

written under each station - & to telling him the practical results which you have given to your first R. Sanitary Commission -- also recapitulating to him what you had said in your letter from Gastein - the substance of which he had seen before -

Altho' you never think of your own dignity, I have a little which indeed is not necessary feeling that

2

it should never be compromised through my foolishness -

Lord Stanley says that he was only waiting for the end of ~~Organ~~-Organization Commissionrs - but says that he will not now wait for that. "At all events" he added "the work of that Commission will be finished by the meeting of Parl=t" -

I hear from Sir A. Tulloch & Mr. Martin

that the bounty "row" among the E.I.C. troops
has made a great
impression upon the
Commiss=n [the
bounty question has
~~made~~ been sent
in for decision to the
Crown lawyer] On
Jan 11 the Comm=rs
decide upon series
of resolutions
regarding whether
the Army is to be
Royal or local -
Lord Stanley it is
supposed. will carry
the day - But the

whole Report, Ld. Stanley
says will be ready
by the meeting of Parl=t.

Of course I was
very careful not to
be "spearing" impertinent
questions at Ld S.
Therefore I kept
rigidly to the matter
in hand -

By the way, I
must just tell you
that Lord S. shewed
my letters to Sir Geo.
Clerk & Sir G. Clerk
spoke of them to Martin
who told me - In
these cases, the poor

woman always goes
to the wall. It is
always supposed
it is she who has
prated - But,
curious way of
doing business as
it seems to me
for Sir G. Clerk to
tell these kinds of
things, I wish you
to know that it
is not I -
It is an immense relief
to me that Lord Stanley
has promised those
three things - In fact
it was all I wanted
Sincerely yrs F. Nightingale

Lord Stanley said
that he must speak
to Lord Derby first.
So he has not done it yet
 I am afraid I am
a bad ambassador
 I am too anxious.
But if Lord Stanley
will just write to you,
& put the matter
into your hands, I
shall be satisfied
& leave you to fight
your own battles -
And I promise,

as the old Prussian
General said in his
prayers, Only give
me this this once,
& I never will
pray to you again.

 Please write
to me at Malvern
 F.N.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

322

October 2012

Signed letter, ff3, pen, Upside down on bottom of last page in another handwriting:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/67

June 30. 1858

Relating to the
Correspondence
Between Farr &
Tulloch

June 30/58

I saw all the
correspondence, which
you have now in
your hands, between
Farr & Tulloch -

Both Farr & I
are anxious, for
Tulloch's sake, that
he should NOT print
his objections. They
are weak, & not

what he would have
written 5 years ago.
And, if he would
but hold his tongue,
he might have the
credit of the Report.

Farr is anxious
that you should tell
Tulloch privately
to withdraw them,
or to send them in

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
privately to the
Director General, who
is with us.

323

October 2012

I doubt whether
even you could
move that obstinate
old square head -
(an obstinacy which
stood us in good
stead at the
Chelsea Board)

The main point

however, is that the
printing of these
objections should
not delay the
sending in of the
Report, which it
must not be
allowed to do -
F. Nightingale

Great Malvern

Aug 19/ 58

Dear Mr. Herbert

At the risk of annoying you, I think I had better tell you how Lord Stanley is going on - He wrote to me thus: *Private* "Ind. Bd.

Aug 14/ 58

"How would this do? Drs. Martin, Sutherland, Simon, to conduct the enquiry: here: without Royal Commissions or any such pompous delays, without compulsory powers, but with all the aid we could give them in collecting evidence from Indian witnesses: special instructions to them not to produce a last Blue Book, but to embody in their Report whatever facts they thought worth preserving: the subjects of enquiry to be, health of troops in first instance and next, the sanitary conditions under which European life is possible in India: their report to be in size, style & subject,

"such that it might serve as a manual to engineers planning cantonments, to Officers in charge of troops & to intending settlers in India. Tell me if you approve & I will speak to the Chairs & get the thing in train at once".

He enclosed a long letter to himself from Sir G. Clerk, approving of a "Commission of enquiry", but giving all the arguments of the "old Indians" to prove that India *must* be unhealthy, as it was from the beginning, is now & ever shall be, world without end.

Lord Stanley concludes "I have heard the same things propounded by others - Possibly you may know whether it is a vulgar prejudice or a scientific truth".

Fortunately for you, I have no copy of my answer - But unfortunately for you I think it expedient to recapitulate my arguments viz. I. that from experience it may be found that 1. it will not do merely to collect evidence in England. Sir G. Clerk's letter

confirms this, for, althou' it states facts it grounds opinions on them, now known to be untenable. Present knowledge tells us the very unhealthiness of which he complains might be prevented.

Before such a Commission as that named by Lord Stanley similar statements would be repeated without end, & the practical result would be what every "old Indian" will uphold that India is essentially unhealthy. Hence

2. The Committee would have to make personally or to direct to be made on the spot by practical persons enquiries to test the truth of such allegations.

Considering the supreme importance of the subject, it would be necessary to give the Committee or Commission as wide Scope as possible

II. As to the constitution

1. it would not do to exclude every element except the Medical. The subjects of enquiry, Engineering, Military, Sanitary & Medical must be exhausted before the Report is drawn up. People acquainted with only one of these subjects would never be able to draw up either

Report, Regulations or Instructions involving the duties of Engineers, Military & Sanitary Officers.

Whether Committee or Commission, it should have

1. Indian Military Officer of high rank
 2. Indian Military ENgineer & topographer
? Col Goodwyn or Bengal Army
or ? " Greene or " "
or ?? Capt. Wichterlony or Madras "
or ?? Lt. Col Grant - - -Bombay "
- [Col. Waugh, I suppose, could not be had for the asking.]
3. Indian Medical (Sanitary) Officer
Mr. Martin
 4. Civil Sanitarian conversant with Camps.
Dr Sutherland
 5. Civil (Sanitary) Engineer
Mr Rawlison
(by far our best water Engineer)
 6. Statistician
Dr Farr
(There must be some one to "read"
the Statistics)

2. & MOST IMPORTANT.

There must be a Chairman over all to *direct* the enquiry, to give consistency to it & to prevent differences of opinion. He must not only have experience in this special subject, but be of such a position as will carry weight with ~~the~~ public opinion.

3. The enquiry must not be hurried & the men who undertake it will have to work at it long & hard.

To conduct the enquiry by the three men named (alone) & in the manner named by Lord Stanley would be to arrive at nothing more than an abstract of existing opinions, an aide-mémoire, or manual- very useful. But Regulations which must be followed would be much more useful. Also, Lord Stanley might be out of office before the Report or Manual was ready- And then, what influence would it have with a Council of "old Indians"? There *MUST* be a Chairman to carry weight with the country.

Also, if Lord Stanley wants an abstract of existing opinion, one of the persons he names, Mr Simon, has no opinions at all, & has had no practical experience of Army topography whatever.

The object of the enquiry should be, certainly, to obtain the practical results Lord Stanley mentions.

In order to do so, however, there must be competent Engineering assistance & evidence, because the result should not be *only* to point out positions for cantonments, but precautions to be taken I making sites more healthy. Such precautions being for the most part engineering works, they must be recommended by capable Engineers, & a manual for Engineers must be stamped with engineering authority.

But the Committee or Commission must also draft Regulations for consideration - and such Regulations involving military, engineering & medical points, it must contain all these elements.

Sir G. Clerk's letter contained the substance of the objections generally raised against India - founded on the

assumption that there is something deadly inherent in all tropical climates & that, somehow or other, disease & death must be the penalty of subduing the earth.

The discovery of the reasons for local unhealthiness is often difficult. And when people unaccustomed to such enquiries come in contact with these problems, they are very apt to take refuge in fatalism. We used to have ague here, till draining was discovered. And Sir G. clerk mentions fevers as growing in gardens in India. And so they will, till man has learnt how to use water in tropical climates.

The very last Report which proceeded from the defunct Bd of Health (by Mr. Simon) only a few days ago lays the blame of the excess of infantile mortality which, since the first Board was broken up, it has taken no means to prevent, on infection & contagion, two exploded superstitions. And it puts forward a scheme of statistics (simply trash) to prove that Sanitary precautions have been greatly over valued, that epidemics are inevitable, & that Quarantine is to be substituted for Sanitary improvements.

Mr. Simon's publications must be considered in the light of a "prospecting" expedition, as they call it in the gold countries. His work may fairly be called "scampish," in the language of the trades.

So far from blaming the "old Indians," they are a green tree compared with the dry one of our old Board of Health. But the Indian question will not be solved by them & we must do it for them.

If Ld Stanley does not like a Royal Commission, it will be more "distingué" (as Ld Castlereagh was without any orders) to have none. And it does not matter much, provided the enquiry be conducted by men specially suited for all departments of the work, by a Chairman who can give unity & precision to it, & with power to extend it to India, if found necessary.

I hope you are better-

ever yours faithfully F. Nightingale
I have heard nothing whatever of the minute-making process having been begun on your "Regulations." *That* Peel might have done just that. I wish his memory could be refreshed. He sent for Capt Galton & said he was very anxious to have the Sanitary

works of Woolwich & Chatham begun
& spend the money. Capt. Galton has
asked for parts of the estimates, in
order that the Report may be sent in
with them - the remainder to be supplied
afterwards. Capt. Galton suggested a
premium for the best cooking apparatus
for Barracks - to which Genl Peel
listened agreeably. The Barrack Co=
will have to lay down the principles.

The Barrack Co: has inspected
Manchester, Preston, Burnly & all
those Barracks. It finds some of
them on much better plans
than the new Aldershot ones.
So we have made progress backwards.

F.N.

Mrs. Herbert will say that I
give you the best possible argument
for not coming back to England,
which I acknowledge.

[envelope, stamped, Malvern Au 20 58]
Austria
Rt Honble Sidney Herbert MP
Bad Gastein
Salzburg
[in another hand] Aug 19 1858
Mss Nightingale
3r letter on India
Army Health Commn
Ld Stanley

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Fragment, needs to fit after "differing from"

330

October 2012

Part of a signed letter, no salutation, ff6, pen
Written on the back of a folio in another handwriting:
Miss Nightingale
June 28. 1858
Relating to
The Warrant
& mistakes
made by
Milton

had been re=cast
by Milton, (about
the last person in
the world who could
know anything about
it - It was like
asking him to cut
off a leg, because he
belongs to a War
Office).

I never was in
the kitchen at the
War Office before -
and whenever I
am chief cook in

that Dep=t, I will
not do the business
in that way.

Upon this infor=
tunate Warrant
there were lengthy
minutes by cooks, 1, 2, 3,
-Acc=t Gen=l Kirby
-Ass=t Under Sec=y Godley
-Chief Clerk Roberts
smaller minutes by
-Under Sec=y Hawes
-Mil=y Sec=y Storks
et id gemus omne,-
the whole of each
differing from every

body's else, & no one
of them having the
most distant
glimmering of the
practical working
of the Warrant, as
intended by you-

The three principal
mistakes were all
~~made~~ however by
Milton - and I made
Alexander put the
original all in
again - But whether
he will carry it;
neither he nor I
shall know - And

The object of this
note is
--would you think
it well to tell Gen=1
Peel to shew you the
Warrant again before
it finally goers in
to the Treasury?

Yours sincerely

F.Nightingale

The THREE MISTAKES were
at "examinations in
Military Medicine,
Surgery & *Hygiene*"
they had substituted

for "*hygiene*" *Medical
Science*, which makes
it nonsense - & is
just the opposite of
what is meant -
2. they had
abolished the value
of Assistant Surgeon's
service and had
made to 20 years
service which was
to raise to the rank
of Surgeon Major
to be 20 years *full*
Surgeon's Service

they had made
the Surgeon of whatever
rank junior in
that relative rank
to all the relative Military
Officers - whatever
the date of Commission.

II. Alexander tells me
That the famous
Crimean Blue Book
(of Smith & Hall)
is lying all ready
in his Office. He
is anxious that you

& I should see it -
but says very properly that, without
Gen=l Peel's authority, he
has no right. If you
would write a word,
he would send it.

III. *Gen=l Peel* has directed
the Netley Comm=n to send
in its Report by Friday.
Phillips's Section is
entirely in support of
you - and this *Section*
they *will not* send in.
Also, they mean to
bring the Hospital out

of the domain of
your "Regulations" by declaring it not to
be a General Hospital
at all - Then what
is it?

I trust that *Gen=l*
Peel understands
that he is not to
lay the Report on the table
of the House *without*
your having first
seen it. It is so easy
to answer -

F.N.

Poor Howell is dead, who wrote
your Review for the Edinburgh.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
incomplete letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/68

334

October 2012

West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise
April 30/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I told Sutherland your wish
that he & Martin should immediately
draw up the paper of questions to
send out to the Indian Stations.
He will have to look at ~~the~~ any
documents, which the E.I. Ho: has
to shew, first. And, as there was
not time for you then to get them
the authority before he started
for Ireland, he put it off till he
came back.

[9:81]

Do not you think that it
will be adviseable for a good deal
of this preliminary work to be done
before the Commissn meets for
business? Because whereas, in

the Crimean case, we had all the experience on our side, in the Indian case, *they* will have all the experience on theirs.

It will not take long to do a good deal - If you would get ~~them~~ us access to all the information at once by asking Lord Stanley to put Dr. Sutherland & Mr. Martin (& if you thought well, Dr. Farr,) into communication with the India Ho:?

The two first ~~They~~ would then prepare the Forms of questions as soon as they ~~have~~/had abstracted the documents necessary - Farr, I suspect, would find no Statistics but what we have already.

I. 1. Dr. Sutherland & Mr. Martin might be asked by you at once to examine all records &c & to abstract the information already available, for you as Chairman -
- to draw up forms for local enquiries: questions for getting local information from all the Stations in India.

perhaps to ~~accompany~~/cause these forms to be accompanied by skeleton maps & plans, which Dr. Sutherland could do very well.

2. Dr. Farr might be asked in the same way to do the same thing as to the present state of Indian Statistics - for you - {There are Reports of the Statistical Socy which he can consult {at home, for this. **[end 9:81]**

3. Mr. Martin *ditto* as to the present Sanitary state of Indian Stations & position of Indian Medical service in regard to it - (a short abstract for you) - **[9:81-82]**

It would not do to be (from want of experience) in the power of the India Council men.

- II. The Commission-work will include (according to its Instructions)
 - Topography Barracks
 - Climate Camps
 - Productions Stations
 - Diseases Hospital
 - Localities Sanatoria
 - Waters _____ Strategic Points
 - Statistics
 - Enquiry into possibility of organizing a system of registration

- 1 Selection of healthy sites
- 3 Sanitary improvements required in existing Stations **[9:82]**
- 2 Enquiry into causes of sickness & mortality in unhealthy Stations **[end 9:82]**
 Diet -Drinks
 Clothing - Duties
 Occupations of troops
 Changes of Stations
 for health
- 4 Organization of an Indian Sanitary Department
 [It is very evident that Messrs Mapleton & Logan are wholly incompetent for this - that it would never to do put the health & hospitals of the Indian Army into such hands - At home public opinion will check their stupidities - In India not - Perhaps each of the three Presidencies must have its own organization - At all events, the D.G. at home must have

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale Balfour is not to leave Chelsea Asylum - Sir R. Napier Bengal Engr as witness before Indian Commission}

West Hill Lodge
 Highgate Rise
 N.

May 6/59

[15:283-84]

Dear Mr. Herbert

The Governors (or whatever they are called) of the R. Mily Asylum held a Board today, at which H.R.H. and Staff presided, & decided that Balfour was not to be spared from dosing the little boys, "and

"they cannot therefore
 "sanction the
 "appointment of
 "Head of the Statistical
 "Branch of the Army
 "Medl Dept being
 "held by the Surgeon
 "of this Establishment."

Probably you may
 have heard from
 Balfour - So I say
 no more -

Had Alexander
 taken his stand firmly

upon the foundation
 laid (by the Report
 which he signed)
 for this Council,
 probably all this
 botheration *scompiglio*,
 would not have
 happened - As it is, Balfour
 will neither leave the Asylum,
 nor accept the other thing, cut down
 as it is. Yours sincerely **[end 15:284]**

F. Nightingale

I am very glad, on **[9:82]**
 the whole, that you
 have Sir E. Lugard -
 I wish Ld. Stanley
 would give the word

to Open Sesame to
 his treasures for
 the beginning of ~~the~~/our
 three.

The Irish inspections
 terminate today.

Do you know Sir Robert Napier, Bengal
 Engineers, (?) who made
 the roads in the
 Punjab for Sir J.
 Lawrence - He is now
 on his way home - is
 a good Sanitarian
 & will give capital
 information as a
 witness. **[end 9:82]**

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

339

October 2012

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: May /59 Miss Nightingale Indian
Commission as to Col. Alison} 2057/F4/68

Highgate

Dear Mr. Herbert

It occurs to me, [9:82-83]

do you know Col.

Alison, late Mil. Secy

to Lord Clyde? If

we cannot have the

bird, at least the

stake the bird sat

upon may taste of it.

Col. Alison has the

credit of being a

highly educated man.

& very good Officer -

I don't know what

more we shall

get than good sense

& local knowledge

in any *Queen's*

Officer - Because

H.M. has no

Sanitary Engineers

in India at all.

poor thing! Col.

Alison was to be

at home from Italy

about this time -

I will send you

every word I can

gather about

Greathed or any body

else tomorrow - [end 9:83]

yours sincerely

F.N.

May 9/59

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale March 2.61 as to the illicit sale of Beer by Serjeants.} 2057/F4/68

I am coming to a use
of my proper senses
as to the "Royal boy."

I think this is a
work of genius -
putting down the
Artillery porter.

Certainly poor
Sir Wm. Codrington's
letter is not.

All he says is
that it is a practice
which he has
allowed to continue

under his government.
And therefore it
must be right.

Why not turn
every Serjeant in the
Line into a beer=
Shop keeper then?
If it is right for the
Artillery, it must
be right for the Line.

But how can
a N.C. Officer
arrest a man for
riot, with the money

in his own pocket
for the drink which
made the man
riotous?

I consider H.R.H.
one of the greatest
of men - He has
"put a stop to
"so improper a
"proceeding" - which
it is.

F.N.

March 2/61

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

341

October 2012

{printed address:} 30 Old Burlington Street.

W.

April 24/61 [15:153-54]

I back Dr. Sutherland.
I have had the largest
experience of the worst
(illeg)/kind of cases - and
am not a hard-hearted
sort of Nurse - And
I consider the "extras"
in the enclosed papers
perfectly preposterous.

I am thoroughly
experienced in the
Civil Hospitals - And
the Military Diet-table

is infinitely superior,
both in variety &
capacity of nourishment,
to every Diet-table
in London - far more so,
to every one in Edinbro' -
most of all so to every
one in Paris.

I consider both the
expece & the composition
of the Diets in "Left
Wing", Woolwich, as
monstrous - & calculated
to bring discredit upon

the whole system of
liberality which has
been adopted in
British Army Hospitals.

It is not necessary
to tell us that the
"Patients did badly"
in this "Left Wing"

F. Nightingale
The Average Cost per
Diet is in this "Wing"
nearly 19d - Speaking
from experience, I assert
that 13d covers the very
highest expence that
need be gone to
for the most fastidious
& desperate cases
as an average cost
per diet. **[end 15:154]**

F.N.

{in another hand, upside down: Miss Nightingale April 24, 1861 agrees with D.
Sutherland as to the Extravagance in the Woolwich Hospital Dietary.}

unsigned memorandum, undated 6ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Old Woolwich Hospital

GENERAL Hosp. scheme.

All hands concur that Col. Clark
Kennedy would be the best *Governor*,
if he will accept it.

that Major Buckley is too old
& wanting in mental activity.

that, if Col. K. would accept it,
the best way would be to leave *him*
to select all the minor appointments, x
(which are all S. of S. appointments,
vide Regns.)

that, if he will not accept, the
best way would be to remit the
whole question back to the
Hospital Corps Commn, of which
Kennedy was Chairman, & to
make *them* recommend to the

x Captain of Orderlies &c &c &c Steward &c

Secretary of State the names of the whole staff.

~~S. of S.~~[Otherwise we know how
the thing will be and it
will be months before any
Commission is procured. Because
all the Commissions will have
to go thro' the Horse Guards]

The building is now ready.

Col. Yolland, R.E. Board of Trade,

Capt. Tyler, R.E.

are both said to be very
good men for Governors -
[But perhaps a R.E. would
not do among the R.A.s.]

The appointment is not looked
upon at all, as you expected -
i.e. as "shelving" a man -

On the contrary, the object being

to train a complete General
Hospital staff for the event of
war, a war would make the
Governor's fortune. He would be made
Bt Colonel, K.C.B. &c &c &c -

Smyrna & afterwards Scutari
made Storke's fortune -

Now Major Buckley is too
old to train for war -

Again, a R.E. w/could take
a Station afterwards & be in
no wise "shelved."

P.S. It is said that "Col. Kennedy
is so exceedingly fond of the
organizing this sort of thing
that it is not unlikely, as
he is a married man, he
might accept it.

General Hosp.
organization
Old Woolwich Hospl
Staff

{in another hand, at the side: Miss Nightingale Appointment of Governor and Staff
at Woolwich General Hospital May 1861}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

344

October 2012

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale}
{in FN's hand:} Governors [15:308-09]
of
Hospitals.

Governors of Hospitals

Col. Wilbraham } recommended
Ass. Adj. Gen. Northern division } by
Surgeon Riach } Sir J. McNeill
Major McCrea R.A. } by Col.
Capt. Theod. Webb R.E. } Lefroy
h.p.
Lt. Col Clifford }
Ass. Q.M.G. Aldershot } by the
Col. J.C. Kennedy } D.G.
Mil. Train. }

note:

These two Dr. Gibson
wishes to propose to you.
We might as well ask
the great Storcks, I am

afraid - to be our Governor
More names are
coming to you -

It will make the
difference of having
the Cape Sanatorium
well or ill governed.
If it is to be ill
governed, have a
Commandant. If well,
a Governor -

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

345

October 2012

unsigned memorandum, 7ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale July 3.1961 on Mrs. Shaw Stewart's first answer to the Proposal that she shd become Superintendent} 2057/F4/68

{printed address:} 30 Old Burlington Street.

W.

July 3/61

The ~~answer~~/course you propose

[15:157-58]

viz "that you might
"persuade her to take
"the place *till* her
"paragon is found -
"if not, that she is
"bound to produce
"a live woman to
"take her place, or
"at the least to
"suggest one" - this,
in civil & official language,
is the *only*
answer.

I am not surprised

at Mrs. Shaw Stewart's
letter - rather, at the
moderation of length
& language it puts on,
which is not customary
in the writer -

If she fails (after
such an answer as
you propose), I have
no other string to
the bow -

1. Her vision of the
Officer's widow is
purely ideal. I have,
of course, the largest
acquaintance in
wives & widows of

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Officers, Medical,
Military & Ecclesiastical,
(with whom Scutari,
Constante & the Crimea
were crammed)- that
any one ever has had
or is likely to have
again. One would
have thought such
a time would have
"called out" some of
them. It is notorious
that not one of them
ever "did a thing,"
or was capable of
"doing a thing". Lady
Canning was the

346

October 2012

laughing=stock of the
whole Army for
sending out poor
Mrs. Moore, the
widow of Col. Moore,
to "nurse the Officers."
She was well known.
~~And~~ She killed herself
by going out boating
at night with the
Officers she was sent
to nurse -

 You know that I
look forward to the
Nursing Service being
ultimately performed
by Officers' & men's
widows as Supts & as Nurses -
But it would be well

-2-

to find ~~the~~ ONE first.

2. "Three month's at St. Thomas's" would *not* prepare any woman to be Supt. altho' excellent as an accessory.

No Civil Hospl service would entirely prepare any woman *by itself*. The one difference, in the Military Hospl, viz that the Nurse is in charge of a large ward full of men, *herself the only woman*, (the other attendants being men,) necessitates changes

which the best Civil Hospl Matron might make the most serious mistakes about. But a Civil Hospl training is *also* necessary, of course.

3. Mrs. Shaw Stewart, as an *inferior*, is not capable as she supposes, of giving hints to her Superior. I am the only person who was ever able to receive such from her. She has actually been (since) obliged to leave a Hospl, because her Superior could not bear her ill-timed interference - She *must be Superior* in the Mily Hospl *while* she is training the ideal. But the ideal

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
may have Civil Hospl training too.

348

October 2012

I would by no means
write to HER these
remarks in my language which are
~~only~~ intended for your
information - I would
simply write to her
what you propose,
reiterating the hint
that the Female Nursing
IF it waits till the
ideal Supt is found,
will wait *for ever* -
but that the ideal
Supt may be found,
she Mrs. Shaw Stewart being once in -
[You will put this
more shortly than I.]
I mean that the

ideal Supt, even if
found, will not be
appointed by a *future*
S. of S.

*This should be
very strongly stated -
as also that you have
very sufficient knowledge
of what is to be expected
of the widows of Officers;
and that you know
of none & have never
heard of one whom
you would entrusting
with such an Office.*
{printed address:}30 Old Burlington Street.
{upside down} W.

I think I
would say this
pointedly. Because

-3-

she has no business
to be advising you
on a point you
must know better
than she -

Would you think
well to add that
~~this~~/Woolwich is a very small
beginning - (4 Nurses
and a Linen Nurse) -
As she has always
advocated small
beginnings, this would
be a point in its
favor to her -

There is some
coquetry in her letter-
And she wants to be

urged.

[She thinks it very
fine to decline being
a Supt for a Nurse.]

If she refuses again
the 2nd time, I would
trench the matter thus:

"will you come then
"as Nurse? i.e. as
"Head Nurse -with
"4 Nurses under you -
"And we will provide
"otherwise for the
"Linen. Meanwhile
"we will look out for
"the Supt while you

are thus laying the ground"

P.S. I do not overlook that she says also "widows of professional x men". "We ~~±~~/have not ~~know of~~/found one such yet: we will look out" - I would say to her -

x as well as "widows of Officers"

[end 15:158]

unsigned letter, 2ff, pen, {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Jul 4.61 on the Instructions to be given to Galton for Devonport} 2057/F4/68

{printed address:} 30 Old Burlington Street.

W.

July 4/61

Lord Herbert will

remember that he ordered Col. Kennedy's Committee to report on turning into General Hospitals Woolwich Devonport Portsmouth

& that these Reports were made -

Woolwich is done
Capt. Galton could

go on with Devonport, if some such instruction as the enclosed were given him.

It appears from what Dr. Farr said this morning that the chief object he has in view in having a Weekly State, *printed* is publicity & the Weekly State being accompanied by Notes pointing out the most important results of the Weekly Statistics, as regards the health & efficiency of the troops, he expects, would direct the attention of the Commanding Officers more pointedly to the Sanitary State of his Regiment, while the Public will be kept fully informed on the Sanitary State of the Army.

[9:866]

Without giving any opinion either on one side or the other, it may be well to consider how far the Horse Guards would permit this publication. A Weekly Return is *indispensable* for the working of the Sanitary Department & *must be had*. Consequently all the Forms & Books required for this Weekly Return are indispensable

[end 9:866]

The only remaining question of importance is the one alluded to, viz. the Weekly *publication*.

The experience of the great loss to the Troops from Tropical Diseases shews the extreme importance of studying carefully the whole subject of Army Hygiene & tropical epidemics, with special reference to applying such ~~local~~ Sanitary measures as may remove the local sources of Malaria. Whether as regards Garrisons, Stations Barracks and Hospitals - upon which such epidemic outbreaks depend - and diminishing as far as practicable the circumstances of ~~personal~~ exposure which tend to augment the individual predisposition of the Men -

[end 9:867]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

352

October 2012

Initialed letter, ff1-11, pen written on envelope:

Miss Nightingale 2057/F4/68

[8:666-68]

Dec=br 27.1860

on Sydney's

leaving the

House of Commons

note in margin on ff8

To Mrs. Herbert

Dec 27, 1860

Hampstead NW

Dec 27/60

Dearest/ I think

Your account -a very

favorable one -

Thank God for it -

and thank you for

sending it. It *is*

favourable, and

favours the idea

that the disease is

more functional

than organic, when

the albumen diminishes

with sleep, exercise

& fresh air - altho'
of course it is liable
to return with any
exhausting cause -

I am sure that
Mr. Herbert could not
have felt himself
his leaving the Ho=
of C. more than I
did [You know how
you & I have
always quarreled
on that point] and
yet I am thankful
that all that is over
& settled -

Of all exhausting causes
the Ho= of C. is the most
exhausting.

Yet I know that
Mr. Herbert will feel
without his Ho= of C.,
as I feel without
my men - now that
I have only Regulations
& not human beings
to deal with. But
it is not true in
his case.

I am quite ready
to sing an Io paeon
now to Lord de Grey,

as much as you like
- to his goodness &
his disinterestedness -
Also, I will say if
you like, that his
Minutes have always
been the only good
ones (*not* excepting

Godley's) in that
blessed War Office.
I am very sorry
to lose him.

I don't at all
undervalue his
sacrifice in being
willing to give up

Office under Mr.
Herbert, which
I am sure was
very great. But he
is quite certain to
be able to get Office
again if he likes it,
by & bye.

Altogether, I am
very thankful-

You may have
a whole wilderness
of Hawes's now, if
you like - keep them
in the park at Wilton,
if there is room for
them - though I

still think my
Netley plan the
best -
ever dearest yours

F.N.

I am not "wedded"
to Lowe. If he has
been sounded, there
is, as you say, "No
more to be said"-
But, if he has not,
he told Clough,
(his Private Secy,)
some time ago,

that he did not like
his present post
it ennuyéd him -
there was nothing to
do.

And generally I
have always heard
men say that the
Under Sec=y ship of
the War Office was
so interesting that
men would give
up more independant
places for it - if
asked.

But I will not
bother you with
another word about

that-

Will you tell
Mr. Herbert that
the Lisbon Hospital
plans, about which
he spoke to me
some time ago
from the Prince,
have come - They
want a deal of
re=arranging. But
the wards will be
the *finest in Europe*.
the proportions are
beautiful.

F.N.

Every "Man=Jack"
of my belongings is or
have been at
Embley for my
cousin Bertha's
marriage to William
Coltman, (son of the
late Judge.) You have
always been so
kindly interested
about Bertha that
I meant to have
told you of it -
especially once
when you said

to me something
"en l'air" about
her marriage -
But it was not
settled then.
And last times
I saw you, you
know why we
could not speak
of anything else but
one thing.
It is a very happy
concern, except
that they are to
live with his

mother, Lady Coltman
- always a great
mistake, I think.
People may have
the tempers of angels
as in this case -
But it never
Answers.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

357

October 2012

West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise
N

May 7/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

Dr. Sutherland is **[9:82]**
here - And he meets
Dr. Farr here tomorrow
for the purpose of
talking over together
some of the preliminary
work of the Indian
Commission - On Monday
he calls upon Mr.
Martin for the same
purpose - But the

work which could be
done between this
& Thursday, (if, as
at present arranged,
the Barrack Commissn
go to Scotland on
Thursday,) would
be very much facilitated
by having the permission
for the India Ho:

You know, of course,
that the Barrack Commissn are
planning a ten

days' Inspection in
Scotland from next
Thursday - And you,
I believe, mean to
meet them ~~our~~/yourself at
Edinburgh on the 17th.

Much of the
Indian preliminary work
cannot therefore
begin effectually,
(if this plan is
carried out,) till
Monday fortnight.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

We have been going over

the Heads of questions
to be sent out to
the Stations in India.

[end 9:82]

{in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale preliminary work of Indian Commission}

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

May 10/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

All the enquiries I
have made tend only
to prove that there is
no (Indian) "Queen's
Officer" at all who will
not be worse than
useless - And if H.M.
made the condition,
She did it to embarrass.
I will send you
tomorrow all the
pros & cons. I hope

you can wait a day
longer. For I have
nothing satisfactory
yet - The answers,
such as they are,
tend to

1. Col. Alison but
merely because
old Colin is
supposed to
have a good
eye for a man
2. Brig. Greathed
but merely
because there
is nobody better
at home -

Such a beggarly array
of empty benches or
rather heads!

I hope to have some better recom=
mendations tomorrow

Farr, it appears,
has some difficulties
with Major Graham,
his chief, about
accepting to be on
the Commissn. And
he asks you to write
to Major Graham saying

you want his (Farr's)
services.

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale no Indian Queen's officer fit
to be on the Commission - as to Col. Alison & Col. Greathed. Major Graham to be
written to about Dr. Farr.}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

360

October 2012

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale Sir John Lawrence for the Indian Commission} 2057/F4/68

West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise

N

May 11/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have a promise **[9:85]**
of Sir John Lawrence's
answer on Friday,
(about a Queen's
Officer for the
Commissn) if you
thought it worth
waiting for. Unfor=
tunately he was from

home - when I wrote
to his friend -

Do you think
that, now at the
11th hour, you could
have him too on
the Commissn &
fence the Queen's
Officer by him, as
they have forced a
Queen's Officer upon
you -

I feel that all

these men whom
we have got (or
have lost) are such
children, rogues, or
asses by the side
of him - and he
is the founder of
anything that is
Sanitary in India.

But you will
be a better judge
of this than I.
I don't see how

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

361

October 2012

Lord Stanley or the
Queen could refuse.
Sir J. Lawrence
might -

I ought to remind
you perhaps about
Alison of the
extremely bad
reputation as to
want of judgment
that hangs about
his family in Scotland. **[end 9:85]**

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

signed letter, 6ff, pen 2057/F4/68

May 11/59
West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise

N

Dear Mr. Herbert

It's choice o'mislikins
"is all I'n got in this
"world."

I The substance of **[9:85]**
the information various
as it is, may thus be
summed up. There are
no superior Queen's
Officers in India -
therefore superior
Indian Queen's Officers
cannot be had -

Except in the late War
& those are not come
back.

I am just where
I was, after having
got all this information.

1. Col. Alison
2. Brig. Greathed.

tho' nothing favourable
or unfavourable is
to be known as to our matters about
this Officer - He can
give information
about strategic points
& positions & is a
most efficient man.

3. Sir W. Colebrooke

This man appears
to have far more
general ability &
experience than any
one else mentioned.
But he is old & his
experience is not
recent- He is
however a genuine
Sanitarian & a
very remarkable
man & admirable
reformer. He is an
Officer of the R.A.,
served as such in
Java & India - was

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
A.D.C. to Lord Hastings
in the Mahratta War
1816-7 when Cholera
first appeared -
Q.M.G. with Sir W.
K. Grant - & many
years in India -
always in tropical
climates. Governor
of N. Brunswick,
recently of Barbadoes.
He is a man of a
much higher class
of mind & character
than any one ~~else~~
we have had
recommended.

363

October 2012

[end 9:85]

4. [but a long way
behind Sir Colebrooke]
M. Genl Boileau
(late 22nd Foot) now
in England - great
local experience
in Bengal & Bombay,
Punjab & field Service.
5. Major Gall 14th Drags.
Though a Cavalry
Officer, long in
India, both in
Bengal & Bombay,
very active &
able Officer
(now in England)

Now I am come to **[9:86]**
an end.

Martin strongly
praises Col. Alison
(No 1)

Sir J. McNeill
has often told me
of Sir Colebrooke's
high character &
abilities. (No 3.) The
Senior U.S. Club
would be sufficient
address -

Every body
speaks well of
Greathed. But then

they say nothing that
would not do for a
man like Gen. Windham
just as well -

Boileau & Gall
are men a good
way lower down -

The worst of it
is that Sir W. Colebrooke
is the only man who
has been the least tried
in our line
of business - The
others may be
geniuses or
altogether wanting.

I have asked Sir
John Lawrence to
recommend (through
a common friend)
but have not yet
his answer -

What would you
think of asking Sir
E. Lugard to send you
(not one but) several
names for you to
choose amongst?

-3-

II Laffan has at last
resigned on account
of ill health - They
will not do any
thing in the way of
change in that
Office till your
Committee has
reported - perhaps
not for a twelvemonth.
It would be well
worth while to
get Galton in
for a twelvemonth.
The office is very
troublesome against

the Barrack Commission.

- Galton might
not accept it, even
if offered to him,
because of the
B. of Trade -

This is what
I hear from the
Whitehall people -
Of course many
things may happen
between this &
then -

III The only *definite*
 & *positive* information
 I have obtained
 from the united
 researches of Drs.
 Sutherland, Farr
 & Martin (relative
 to beginning the
 Indian Sanitary
 Enquiry) is that
 there is a Clerk
 who has been
 150 years (sic)
 in the India Ho:
 who will know
 all about the

documents there when
 we have got the entrée. **[end 9:86]**

Yours [illeg] sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale Indian Commission as to Col. Alison,
 Col. Greathead, Sir W. Colebrooke, Genl Boileau, Major Gall - Laffan resigned -
 suggests Galton}

signed letter, 2ff, pen

May 13/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

At the last moment **[9:87]**

Sir J. Lawrence's
 answer has come -
 He evidently thinks
 that you might as
 well "ask him to
 "dance, having tied
 "up his legs" - (In fact,
 he says so) - as choose
 a Queen's Officer.

He would choose,
 he says, if he must, Col. Campbell

of the 52nd, or Col.
Orlando Felix,
who has been 18
years in India.
He does not know
Col. David Russell,
he says - He does
not like Greathed
or Alison.

He does not *highly*
extol even his
Col. Campbell - [He
knows him by
character only.] ~~He~~
but calls him "the only
officer he would name". He

puts Col. Felix, ~~however~~,
second to Campbell.

I am afraid
this kind of
information will
only offuscate you.
But if Airey or
Lugard have sent
you lists, it may
help to have
Sir J. Lawrence's
imprimatur -

in great haste

sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

Lawrence is of course

very careful not
to commit himself
in any general
condemnation of
the Queen's service.
He only speaks "of
these matters"
"for this purpose"

&c **[end 9:87]**

{in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale Indian Commission Sir J. Lawrence's
opinion of Col. Campbell, Col. Felix, Col. Greathead Col. Alison}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

368

October 2012

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale Indian
Commission Ross Mangles' opinion of Col. Greathed} 2057/F4/68

Highgate

May 14/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

This is the last: **[9:87]**
vero ultimo.

Ross Mangles, a
poor judge you will
say, says Greathed
is a man of great ability

But do you know
old Martin says
that, when he was
Presidency Surgeon &

Mangles Secretary at
Calcutta, he (Mangles)
was the only person
who ever gave him
help in improving
(illeg) that sink of all
un=Sanitary abomination,
viz. our capital of
India.

Greathed is about
50 - a nephew of
Glyn, the banker -

Probably you have
decided long since.

I only report my last. **[end 9:87]**

yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

369

October 2012

signed letter, 3ff, pen {in another hand: Army Medical School Miss Nightingale
May 19. 59} 2057/F4/68

West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise

N

May 19/59

[15:371]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Sir Jas. Clark is
in great tribulation
about the Medl Sch.
And I advised him
to write to you direct.
Enclosed is the
effusion - I have
no doubt Sir J. Clark
is a fidget - And his
preference of Panmure
over Peel & of A.
Smith over Alexander

is the oddest choice.
Still I have no
doubt, because I
hear it from Martin
too, & very venomously, that Alexander
thinks to win the
Army Medl Chairs
for his men, (as
he has done the
Council,) by working
on Genl Peel - &
that you will have
to interfere -
Alexander is really
too bad - in this -
Martin ~~he~~ says he is
quite impenetrable.

[end 15:371]

As Greathed is to
be only ornamental,
it is a good name
to have - And Sir
E. Lugard's letter is the
letter of a man of
thought & feeling,
tho' not of a man
of the world. [I wish
he would not appeal
to Hawes.]

I shall not break
my heart about
Sir J. Lawrence. Tho'
he is a much better
Sanitarian than Lord

Stanley. What he
seems to have said
is absurd enough -
But whatever was
done in India by
him or his brother
was good Sanitary
action. However, it
does not do to have
a man of that
weight second on a
Commissn who, if
he were to go wrong,
might go & write
a Report all to
himself, which
would be awkward.

[9:88]

I had another
 reason for wishing
 Sir J. Lawrence
 to become intimate
 with you - But that
 you can do ~~all~~ any
 way, if you like.
 He says that things
 may ripen for
 another uproar
 in India - that
 there are seeds &
 that he cannot get
 Ministers in England
 to attend to him. [end 9:88]

Yours sincerely
 F. Nightingale

signed letter, 3ff, pen {in another hand, Nightingale Fund 1859} 2057/F4/68

Highgate
 May 24/59

IN RE N. FUND

No hurry.

Believe me, I have not
 been neglecting this. And,
 during March & April,
 in town, I saw or
 corresponded with
 pretty nearly all the
 Hospital authorities
 & female Superinten=
 dents in esse or in posse
 that could be applied
 to the Fund.

I will not tell you
 in writing (tho' I could
 any day ~~in~~ viva voce)
 all the pros & cons of
 the different plans
 I have successively
~~tried~~/tried to initiate.

The most promising;
 that of the "London", qua
 Hospital, & of Miss
 Blackwell, M.D. qua Superintendent, has
 fallen thro'. And I am
 bound to say the
 Hospital shewed itself
 far more accommodating
 than the lady. [She is

going back to America.]

Miss Erskine, who
was Supt. of the Naval
Hospital at Therapia,
I have wooed in every
way. She will not be
won to leave her own family
again. It is in vain
to try her any more -

The grasses are green -
So I will not deplore
these two & sundry
other schemes - one
of which was to tack
ourselves on to St.
John's House at King's
College Hospital. For

various reasons, that
will not do -

I have talked
over the matter at
great length with
Sir John McNeill

For some months
past, I have also
discussed it with
some of the authorities
of St. Thomas' Hospital.

The Matron of
that Hospital is the
only one of any *existing*
Hospital I ~~sh~~/could
recommend - to form a
"School of Instruction" for Nurses -

It is not the *best*

CONCEIVABLE

way of beginning. But
it seems to me the
best POSSIBLE. It will
be beginning in a
very humble way -
But at all events
it will not be
beginning with a failure
i.e. with the possibility of upsetting
a great Hospital - for
she is a *tried* Matron.

Sir John McNeill
leaves town on Saturday.
So that he will not
see you again. I have
therefore asked him
to write to you about
some business matters

relating to the
appointment of an
Executive Committee
&c - & a Secretary,
a kind of man of
business, with whom
I could communicate,
to settle all the
details with the
Hospital authorities,
which it would be
unreasonable to
expect any of the "Fund"
=Council to undertake.
I have written a
kind of Programme,
which I will shew you.
Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Highgate

[12:123-24]

May 26/59

PRIVATE

In re N. Fund

Sir J. McNeill shewed me the ~~letter~~/draft he was writing to you & which you will have today - I agree so far.

1. The proposal of a Secretary & of Mr. Clough as Secy, which originated from Sir J. McN & not from me, I think quite essential not only to the success but to the very starting of the scheme -

I don't know whether Mr. Clough would take it. But if *he* does not, I can't conceive who else would do -

I think the Secy must be the servant of the Council & not mine, & that he must be a paid

Servant -

I should therefore wish to leave £10000 to the Fund, (the income of which is now about £1344 per ann.) which would increase it to about £1700 per ann. This would provide for the pay of a Secy. And I cannot conceive that, for the first 3 or 4 years (*afterwards* a mere Clerk would do) a Secy who undertakes so troublesome a business ~~should have~~/could be found for less than £300 a year - I might easily have managed this privately between Mr. Clough & myself, (if he will act, which I don't know-) But I think, as I said before, he must be the Secy of the Council, in order

to act at the Hospital with their authority in their name,; & *not* as my friend - certainly.

2. Sir J. McNeill's little Executive Committee of three I think is quite necessary - But Mr. Clough thinks that he, Sir J. McN., must be fourth on it himself - ~~for~~& that, even with him at Edinbro', it will act better so than with any one else in London - Because he is almost the only man on the Council with an organizing head. Why did you name them then, you will say. And I have often asked myself why. But I have known, ~~durin~~ since I named that Council, a *great many* men under the most singularly favourable circumstances for finding out organizing talents - And I could not name a

better Council now if I were to try -

As for Doctors, Civil & Military, there must be something in the smell of the medicines which induces absolute administrative incapacity. And it must be something very strong too, for they all have *opportunity* for developing administrative capacity, (almost more than any other profession) if it were but there -

The three Civil Doctors on the Council are perfect infants in this respect - And Mr. Clough expressed his perfect repugnance to bringing business before them, if they were to form alone the Executive Committee -

Dean Dawes & Col. Jebb (oh why does he call himself Sir Joshua) ~~are~~/have both great power of organization - but both are such very busy men -

F. Nightingale [end 12:124]

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand, Miss Nightingale June 26.1859. On the Army Medical School at Fort Pitt} 2057/F4/68

June 26/59

We have put a complete copy of the Army Medical School inside your own letter in the India rubber band -

We have pinned in some slips into your own letter giving rather fuller answers to the letter of June 3.

The mistake of the whole Correspondence

is referring back questions regarding the School, not to the Commission entrusted with its organization, but to the D.G.

Alexander's letter assumes for himself the very position (in reference to the Chairs) which the R. Commission guarded most carefully against any D.G. occupying.

For otherwise the School would be subordinated to the Army Med. Dep.

Longmore or Trench would do very well to fill both Chairs (Medical & Surgical)

But, as there must probably be two men to do the Hospital work, (Medical & Surgical Divisions) why not both Professors?

F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

377

October 2012

signed letter, 6ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Army Medical School
July 4 59} 2057/F4/68

July 4/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

About the ARMY

MEDICAL SCHOOL?

How would this do?

To have three Professors

(as once proposed) viz

1. Surgery -----*Army man*
2. Medicine-----E. INDIAN
3. Hygiene -----*Civilian*

These to form the Senate:

-then 2 Teachers

{Army men

1. Pathology {would yield
2. Chemistry {these to the
{Civilians

You see the E. Indian
service is so incomparably
superior, in point
of good men, to ours,
that it would be
an absurdity to put
their men to School
to ours - if, as
is most desirable,
you carry out your
plan of having ~~the~~
E. Indian candidates
to your School.

I am sure that,
if you had read one

half of the E. Indian
Medical Reports which
Sutherland & I have
been reading up, you
would at once say
- that Alexander
is not fit to be an
Assistant Surgeon to
these men - far less
that Alexander's men
should be their
teachers.

The *non*=sense of it
is in calling it an
Army Medical School
at all - Now, if an

E. Indian were *one*
of the Professors, it
would break down
the delusion at once.
And, if the E. Indian
candidates (& possibly
the Navy candidates)
were admitted &
passed too ~~together~~, the
true sense of the
School would
appear -

The fact is that
you must make
the school, you must
constitute the school,
you must govern the

-2-

School yourself. The
Army & the Director
General must have
nothing to do with
it - And the blind
must not be put
to teach the blind -

Alexander has
been boasting that
he has got five
prizes for the *Army*
in the 5 Professorships.

Now his arguments
are so easily replied
to.

1. "Parkes has had
no experience of

campaigning - *his* men
have" - But what have
they made of it? There
is not one who has
made himself capable
to teach Sanitary
campaigning or indeed
has learnt it.

2. look at all
your experience of
Barracks & Hospitals.
Why there is not an
Army Medical man
concerned with them
who ought not to
have been brought
to a Court=martial
for having them in

a state which, - bad
as the Civil Hospitals
are, - represents what
~~they~~/Civil Hospitals were 150 years
back. There is not
one of these men who
has known what ventilation
is. Is not this a
disgraceful fact?

But about the E.
Indians

I think you will
find a general
conviction among
scientific men that

Army Medical men
occupy (except in
Surgery) a rank in
the profession equal
to that of the *bassi*
chirurgi of Rome &
Naples - that the
E. Indian men occupy
the very highest
rank in the profession.
higher than the Civilians.

Bird, a man at
the E.I. Ho: (whom I
have mentioned to
you) is by no means
one of their best men,
but he would fill

-3-

the Chair of Medicine
with about 6 times the
efficiency of any of
Alexander's men -

[He is now in London
& lecturing gratis
at St. Mary's †/Hospital]

But, if you *should*
think of having an
E. Indian Professor,
let us, please, inquire
for you whether there
are not better men
than Bird -

You see it would
be a great thing to

have a man
conversant with
Indian diseases -
as we are always
talking about our
poor "sequels" - &
to have a man
practised in teaching.

And the E. Indians
never would send
their men to your
School without
such a man being
Medl Professor. He would also
teach a certain amount of Indian Hygiene

I have been
talking over the whole

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
matter with Sutherland
to see what the
fruit of his cogitations
(after reading at the
India Ho:) was - And
~~his~~/this is exactly his
opinion -

The E. Indian men
would just "envoyer
promener" the whole
boutique of Alexander
& Co.

Sutherland strongly
urges that the School
should be delayed
a year rather than
make the irretrievable

mistake at first of
choosing a teacher
among the men you
wish to teach.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

~~Excuse length.~~

We don't care about the
Chemistry at all, if
you like to give that
to an Army man - Let
them burn their fingers
& blow themselves up.
So much the better

~~Martin is quite behind hand~~
compared to some of these E. Indians.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

383

October 2012

30 Old Burlington St
July 27/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have read thro'
all your Regulations &
Sutherland part - To=
morrow we shall go
through them line by
line -

The Revise is divine.
It is just putting back
every thing "as you were".
It is, as far as in it
lies, re=establishing
what has so often all

but lost a British
Army.

All the discoveries
& conclusions which
Sir J. Graham's
Committee will make
will not display the
nature of the W.O.
half so well as these
Minutes & alterations
do -

You say Job was
not in the War Office.
No: nor Hercules either
What were *his* Labours?
Nothing at all.

The two most important points struck out, viz. 1. the appointment of a Governor to General Hospitals by the S. of S.

&2.the recommendations in writing by the Medical Officer

will have, however, to be decided by you, with reference to the new changes, before we can do anything.

And I enclose a Memo on these points - to say why

otherwise I should not have troubled you till we had done the whole -

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 29 July/59 {illeg{ 1859 Miss Nightingale on the regulations as revised by the WO Comee}

unsigned memorandum, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Memo on the Regulations

The Regulations, as amended by the Committee, are as good a representation of the state of the W.O. as one would wish to have -

We have gone over the alterations cursorily & will do so in detail -

So far as we can judge, with the exception of a few alterations, the Regulations will have to be restored nearly to their original form -

The chief point of importance they have raised is about the Governorship of a General Hospital. And their difficulty is in bringing together the two jurisdictions, viz. the Military & that of the War Office.

The necessity of a direct connection between the Governor & the War Office

is clearly shewn at P. VI of your own letter prefixed to the Regulations & which they have left entire.

They, on the other hand, conceive that the seniority of a Military Officer on a Station gives him a thorough knowledge of Hospital organization -

If their plan be carried out, it puts the Military Hospitals back to what they were at the beginning of Scutari -

At all events, the Governor *must* be appointed by the S. of S. for War. & hold his office during the pleasure of the S. of S.

The only point is to prevent any jarring in the jurisdiction of the S. of S. over the Hospital & of the Commander of the Forces over military discipline.

This we must ask you about - Because, will it not depend very much on the conclusions you come to as to the relations between the Horse Guards & the W.O.?

II. They object to the Medical Officer reporting in writing in all cases.

The number of recommendations will depend materially upon the course taken in re = organizing the *Barrack Dep.*

The Barrack Commission has arrived at the conclusion that the Barrack Dep. should be charged directly - in any Barrack Regulations, - with keeping all Barracks & Hospitals in a good Sanitary state - Were this done, the interference of the Medical Officer would be seldom called for - except as regards diet,

dress & duties -

Medical Officers' representations would then be complaints against the Barrack master, to be redressed thro' the agency of the Commandg Officer, who, of course, will be willing to see his Barracks placed in a good condition, & will refer the complaint to the Barrack master - A good Barrack system will save reporting - to a very large extent -
July 27/59

Regulations

{in another hand: July 27.59}

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: qualifications for candidates}
2057/F4/68

30 Old Burln St.

Aug 3/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

We have read thro' your documents on the Army Medl School.

They are the most extraordinary documents that ever were issued on the subject - shewing such a total ignorance as they do of the state of Medical education at this day,

and in such direct
opposition to the views
of the Commission on
the Army Medl School
& to what they require.

In a day or two,
we will send you a
paper with the objections
to it - and a plan
for your own consideration,
with the form of a
letter to Alexander -

What Alexander
has done is this: he

has not only required
a License & Diploma,
but he has dictated
to the Schools & Colleges
upon what conditions
such certificates
should be granted.

The printed paper,
dated 1859, is a
reprint of Dr. Smith's
paper, given into the
R. Commission of 1857.
- and which Dr. Smith.
as a member of the

Medl School Commission
practically set aside.

- ~~And~~ the M.S.
memoranda are
merely aggravations
of the original sin.

They should all be
sent, according to
their own arrangement
"to a _____ Hospital
"for Mental Derangement
"for _____ months."

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

388

October 2012

30 O. Burlington St
Aug 10/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

We have made a **[9:94]**
List of Stations in
the three Presidencies
to which to send
copies of the Indian
questions -

We submitted this
List to Col. Baker
at the India Ho:
And we have just

received it back
as correct - [Col Baker
was informed what
was the object]
There are no fewer
than 166 !!! of which
there is accommodation
for *Queen's* troops
at 82
for *Company's European*
troops at 97
& for *native* at
148

About 6 are

occupied by *Queen's*
troops alone.

Will you tell us
how we should
send out the 82
copies for *Queen's*
troops?

We would rather
they should go out
thro' the *War Office*
by your ~~(illeg)~~/orders to
the *Queen's* Commanders
in the Presidencies.

Or must they go

with the others through
the *India Ho*:?

[end 9:94]

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 10 August 1859 Miss Nightingale has made list of stations in
India to wh. to send queries -}

signed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Montague Grove

Hampstead

Sept 2/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

1. we think that
it would be adviseable
to print & bind up
Alexander's "bouquet" -
But, before it is done,
we should like to
collate the "Queen's
Regulations" with the
new Regulations - in
case that there should
be any deficiencies or
discrepancies. Could

you tell them to send
us a proof of each?
The great Pan told
us, you know, to
oversee the "Queen's
Regulations" -

2. Sir C. Wood
must "pay the Doctor."
because the R.C.
has power to call
for any information
or documents. And
if they can't give
them, they must get
them. & pay the cost.

3. Ld Stanley is quite as troublesome ~~in~~/as Achilles in more matters than "sulking". But his declining is very serious - We want a man not only of great weight of *position* (~~this~~/which is quite essential) but a hard worker & he must have some practical knowledge of the subject. It is such an opportunity of doing a great work -

greater, I think. than the other - We will think & think & send you word -

4. I don't remember any Purveyor at Scutari who was madder than the average - I remember two or three who were rather less mad than the rest - *Tucker & Toller* are the only Purveyors I remember who were in the East, of names at all like "Turner" - [There is an ~~Asst.~~ Deputy *Commissary*=Genl named

"Turner"] On the whole,
I incline to think
that your correspondent
is romancing. Jenner,
I rather think, was
the best Purveyor out
there - But he was
in the Crimea - and
nothing very *extraordinary*.
I can't at all remember
the man in question.
I think he must only
have been a super=
numerary clerk -

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 1859 Sep. 2. Miss Nightingale wishes to compare the "Queen's"
with the new Regulations & asks for a Copy}

signed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Hampstead

Sept 15/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

The old original "cow
& snuffers" represented
in ~~the~~ Mapleton's Netley
Committee has re=appeared
with Mapleton in the
D.G.'s Board - [I recognise
his hand in all these
papers.] They shift &
shift. They can't read
~~recognise~~ an Act when
they see it. And they

stick to old A. Smith's
predilection for a little bit of power
& try to dictate from
the A.M.D. to Bodies
far before them. They
have not the most
elementary knowledge
of what is going on
in Medical Education
now -

At the same time,
Alexander is right in
quoting against us
the first ~~two~~ pages
of the "Organization
School" Report. ~~They~~/That

does the same thing. It
~~are~~ is wrong & ought
not to be there at all.
A. Smith put it in and
Sir J. Clark modified it.
Had the new Medical Act
been in force then, you
would never have allowed
it. It is a handle for
Alexander against us
& the only principle now
is compromise - But
he fancies he is progressing
& he is retrograding.
He sees exactly where
he "has" us -

The last page of
Alexander's reply is all

one muddle in his head -
He thinks himself a
Licensing Body.

The real proof of a
man's competence is
not in the "School" he has
been at, not in his
"certificates of attendance"
&c at all but in *what you are
going to exact*, in his
examination -

The most provoking
part of it is the time
wasted by you in reading
our Explanations & by
us in writing them -
because there is really
no principle involved.

It is only a controversy.

To prevent further
muddle, whenever any
thing like a written
agreement is come to,
we should be glad to
go over the Scheme -

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

If you send what we
have now written to
the "cow & snuffers", it
will only lead to further
controversy. The elements
for coming to an agreement
are in the last two pages,
from "To sum up." The only

other thing to be done
would be to re=Summon
the Organization Commn
with Alexander instead
of A. Smith -

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale 15 Sep. 1859}

Montague Grove
Hampstead N W
Sept 22/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

We have gone over the "Regulations", with reference to the various alterations that have been proposed by the D.G. and Dr. Balfour -

The D.G. has made a few verbal changes which we have adopted. He has also sent two additional Forms and five Lists, which we have also put in.

We have consulted Dr. Farr about Dr. Balfour's proposed alterations. The most important of these is the substitution of a *Weekly Return of Sick* to be abstracted in *his* Office, instead of yours sincerely

a series of Returns, on which the Regimental Officer virtually made the Abstract before sending it to the Army Medical Dept. Balfour's plan diminishes the work of the Regimental Surgeon, while it increases the work of the Statistical Office. On this substitution, Dr. Farr remarks: "Dr. Balfour proposes to give all the required information and it is quite fair to let him do his own work in his own way for the reasons he assigns. Reg It was found however at the trial that the method of working by slips proposed by us was the most expeditious - Does not Dr. Balfour think that his method will involve more work & create delay?

If this should prove to be the case, he had better give the method suggested by the Statistical Commission a fair trial."

Under these circumstance, we have taken out these particular Forms (of the Commission) & put in Dr. Balfour's.

2. Next, as to the *Registration of Deaths*. The Commission proposed a Quarterly Register to be sent by the Regimental Surgeon to the Regr ~~R~~ Genl. Dr. Balfour adopts the same Form but suggests that the D.G. should make up the Quarterly Return & send it to the Registrar-General. On this Dr. Farr makes the remark: "The Registrar General adopts this suggestion & will be glad to receive the Returns on the proposed Form.

The D.G. will have the goodness to write to the Registrar General on the subject officially."

The Statistical difficulty is therefore arranged.

We have farther made a few verbal alterations - But the most of our work has been in changing the references & pages, on account of the above alterations -

The proof is so mauled that we do not think you can possibly consider these revisions & changes till it has been in the printer's hands - And we have only sent it to you for duty's sake. Perhaps you will be so good as to order the Printer to send us the Revise as soon as possible; we should like to go over it before it goes into any other person's hands.

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: 22 Sept 1859 Army Medl School}
2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

Sept 22/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

We send you a corrected Proof of the Medical School plan - with the Sections arranged in proper order. At the latter end of it are the Rules for Examination before Promotion; and following these are three Classes

under which Candidates for Admission are to be arranged after their first examination. The proof contains too much or too little: Φ /to make it what it ought to be, it ought to include the D.G.'S requirements for admission to the Service. We have not yet seen the final adjustment of these.

The Requirements should stand first - next, the Constitution of the Examining Board - then should follow the three Classes (on the last page of the Proof) - after these, should come the Medical School: & last of all should follow the Rules for Examination for Promotion - This would

make it a complete document, if you think it advisable to do this. But, before this is done, we should know 1. what the requirements are to be
2. what the Examining Board is to be -
3. whether the India Govt will send their Candidates - As soon as we get this information, we could complete the thing, if you think fit.

Yours sincerely
F.N.

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W
Sept 23/59

[15:285]

Dear Mr. Herbert

A copy of a "work" issued by the War Office, in July of THIS year, (!) containing "Instructions to Military Hospital Cooks" has been put into my hands -

It purports to teach cooks how to dispose of the materials of the new Hospital Diets (in the "Regulations").

it just puts back the Hospital Cooking to where it was at the beginning of Scutari & the Crimean War -

It seems to rest upon the old exploded principle that all the cooking for the worst class of cases is to be done at three several times a day or ~~at~~ (exclusive of the two "teas") at *one* time. This was exactly the system at Scutari - where *all* the "Extras"

were issued to the Patient at once. And if he could not eat them, they stood by him cold.

This is actually laid down as Regulation in the "work" in question (which is said to be Genl Peel's own composition) where a mixture called Arrowroot, but which is Starch, is to be made all at once & "to be eaten cold."!!

A few of Soyer's receipts are thrust in by way of contrast.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/68

400

October 2012

Hampstead N W

Sept 26/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

We hope this matter
(of the D.G.) may be considered
now as finally settled.

The D.G. has conceded,
but in such a way as
to leave a doubt regarding
the Schedule unsolved.
The arrangement of the
Articles is not logical.
And, by placing the
Schedule at the beginning
instead of the end,

there is still an opening for something like a special Course of study. Fortunately, by a little arrangement & a few verbal alterations, we have been able to adopt almost the words of the D.G.

Now that this is arranged, another very important subject presents itself - There is no reference in the Schedule to the Army Medical School - And

if it be issued in its present form, the Public will be left in the dark on this matter

We have therefore interwoven with the Qualifications the School attendance - the second Examination and also the Examination for Promotion - so that, in the state the Document is now sent to you, it contains everything the Candidate requires to know, except his daily pay allowed at

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
the School.

402

October 2012

If you approve of the Document as it now stands, and would return it to us, we should have it made up with the Proof of the Medical School Organization & sent to the Press, in order that you might consider the whole together -

[Our No 4 gets over the inconvenience of the Schedule by using it simply as a List of certificates of

attendance required by Licensing Bodies.]

Your Minute wisely leaves the No of Labours to be determined by the Medical Council - Alexander says 12, which was the compromise agreed to.

He has left out the specification of 100 beds for the Studying Hospital. And he has "recommended" five Certificates on subjects of General Education, to which we have agreed.

{in another hand: 1859 Sep. 26. Miss Nightingale on the Qualifications for Candidates for the Army Medical School}

Taken in connection
with the Medical School
scheme, the Requirements,
as we have re=arranged
them, & the Schedule
for the use to which
we have put it, will
answer the intended
purpose -

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

signed letter, 7ff, pen {in another hand: Oct/59 Miss Nightingale urges Mr.
Herbert to insist upon the India House furnishing the information it possesses.}
2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W
October 7/59 [9:96-98]

In re India House.

Dear Mr. Herbert

If you would write a short
and tempestuous note to Sir C. Wood,
after the manner of the D. of Wellington
in Spain to Mr. Filder, and say
that our supplies *must* come, (whether
there be any or not,) or he ~~would~~/will be
hung, - our supplies *would* come.

The thing is after this wise:
If the India House puts its washing
out, every thing is well & punctually
done - What washing it does at
home is not done at all.

Mr. Prinsep has sent back
our last Form, with much absurd

and ignorant Commentary of his own upon it - and has written a note to Dr. Farr, which I have, as also the Form, saying that the Indian Commission must seek for its information in India.

Now we know that this is not true. The information *is* in the India Ho: And the only question is how to get it out.

The Office throws all kinds of obstacles in the way - And for the sake of saving a few clerks at a few pounds a week, (for a limited time) - the results of the Returns made for years with great labor & at great cost are not to be given to the Commission.

Mr. Hornidge (of the India Ho:)

is entirely on our side.

The information is in the India House - *in Col. Baker's Department*. Dr. Farr has seen the Rolls there himself - And it would be a mere waste of time & labor to send to India for them. Our Forms ask merely for information, which the Rolls supply. To say they do not - is merely a "put-off."

The India Ho: has not answered your letter - which they have had in the Mily Dep. for 3 months - so I am informed.

The only course is for you to write again, I am afraid, & ask them to supply the information which the Commission requires.

Two or three "writers", (or more if necessary), must be employed to do the work, under the supervision of Mr. Hornidge; with whom Dr. Farr would consult.

I should consider it an honor, if I might be allowed to pay (thro' you) these "writers".

The India Dep. will not do our work as Establishment work, for they have as much as they can do of their ordinary routine work.

But a note from you to Sir C. Wood will bring Mr. Prinsep to his senses.

Surely it is of some importance to get at the results of their past experience; and to put them in the

way of profiting by future observations in India.

The whole "fencing" is a mere matter of work & of a few good clerks for a short time; to pay whom, if you would allow me to put £100 in your hands, I should be delighted.

Sir C. Wood is as sharp as a needle. But he does not know anything at all about our work. And the comments of Prinsep & Co: pass muster with him, & dispose fatally of questions of the utmost importance, by simply putting them on the shelf.

Mr Prinsep was happily (for us) married this week; and

is now out of the way, which is happier still. **[end 9:98]**

Mr. Hornidge (our friend) is at the India Ho: now -

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

406

October 2012

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: 1859 Oct 7 Miss Nightingale Suggests putting the Adjutant General & a first-rate Barrack Master on the "Regulations" Commission when re=appointed} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

Oct 7/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

The "Regulations"

Commission, on its re=appointment, will have to take into consideration changes in two sets of Regulations at least - the "Queen's" & the "Barrack". Would

you not think well to put on the Adjutant=Genl, and a first=rate Barrack Master?

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

It would save, do you not think, much contest with the Horse Gds.

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

Oct 8/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

To "do homage to the unusual "excitement in the War Office", we hereby return not only what you have asked for but more than you asked for.

We return a Corrected Proof of the "Qualifications", in the form to be issued to Candidates.

2. we send you a corrected Proof of the "Medical School" plan with the "Qualifications" prefixed: as we think the whole procedure from candidature to promotion

was what you wished to be in one document.

3. we see no objection to printing the Qualification in the "Regulations", should you think fit. But, at the same time, the Rules for Examination on Promotion, P. 3, of the "Qualifications" are the only portion of the Document which interest a man acting under the "Regulations" & who may be supposed to have passed all the dangers of Pages 1 and 2. The Rules for Promotion, however, might very well be printed as an Appendix to the "Regulations".

4. Would it not be advisable to print the "Warrant" in the "Regulations"

Appendix? If so, would you send us a copy?

We shall be able to return you the "Regulations", finally completed, on Monday.

We should like to have Proofs of the "Organization Medical School" & also of the "Requirements."

I have put your name where I think it ought to be. But I can take it out. [It is on the last page of the "Organization"; which is a kind of Warrant. The "Qualifications" are a mere Office Form.]

Please to read over I, P. 1, in the "Organization", with reference to the *Indian Medical Officers & Engineers*. May this go?

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: 1859) Oct 8 Miss Nightingale sends a corrected Proof of Qualifications & of Medical School. suggests the printing of the "Warrant" in the Regulations Appendix & asks for a Copy.}

Hampstead N W
Oct 19/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I find from Circular
No 464 that "J.R. Godley",
"in accordance with the
"recommendation of the
"R. Commission," which
appoints *Governors* to
organize all General
Hospitals & be
responsible for all
their stores, ~~appoints~~ & buildings

therefore "directs" that
"the charge of all
"buildings, grounds &
"stores" in "General
Hospitals" ~~sh~~ "be
transferred" to the
"Purveyor of the District."

[Are the *Governors*
gone to bed? without
even putting the
"Principal Medical
Officers", in charge?]

Practically the *Purveyors*
seem to have gained a
great step by being
raised into skeleton
Governors by "J.R. Godley".

Circular No 464 contains
only 23 *Purveyor's* Regulations,
by which the functions
of *Purveyor* & Barrack=
master, (two co=ordinate
authorities in General
Hospitals now) are all trans=
ferred to *Purveyor* -
which is certainly better

than having the two
at open war, or the
one extinct, as the
Barrack master was
at Scutari.

"Trifling repairs of
a pressing or urgent
nature" are also
provided for. [What
is a "trifling" repair
of an "urgent" nature?]

Capt. Belfield, in
his Minute on the
Corfu case, treated
this Circular as one

for converting Garrison
into General Hospitals.
And at first sight
it bears this construction.
But, inasmuch as
it is not so, it is
questionable whether
Beatson, Principal
Medical Officer at
Corfu, would have
any power of
distributing the sick,
irrespective of
Regiments, throughout

all the wards, in
order to equalize the
cubic space - a thing
so urgently required
that Col. Lefroy
tried to force it
upon Dr. Beatson of
his own authority -
and all the Minutes
make mention of its
necessity.

It appears to me
that Beatson was right;
& that Lefroy & Bel=
field are wrong. For
the forthcoming Regulations

(only) provide that the discipline which such intermingling of the sick requires shall be executed by the Governor. And at Corfu there is no Governor.

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

The Minute of Beatson & the "Board of Officers" at Corfu is in fact a petition for erecting Corfu Garrison Hospital into a "General Hospital" {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Oct 19. 59. on Purveyors' Duties & the state of Corfu Hospital}

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Oct 27 1859 Drs Rutherford Cooper-Anderson fit for China as Sanitary Officers.} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

Oct 27/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I knew Dr. Rutherford well in the Crimea & liked him much. He is an honest man, of good ordinary intelligence, & considerable honour; (an article little known in the Army but much prized in Civil Life). He is a very

good Surgeon - As for
Sanitary knowledge,
Alexander might
just as well appoint
Mapleton or any
other Surgeon; or any
N.C. Officer, for that
matter -

I have asked
Sutherland about
him, but he does
not remember him
at all -

[Rutherford was a
2nd Cl. Staff Surgeon when
I knew him, not a
Regimental Officer at
all.]

The only man in
the Army who is
unmistakeably possessed
of great Sanitary
talents is *Cooper*.
He is master of his
art - both in practice

& in theory. The only
caution he wants is,
not to set other people
against his good things.
But as to knowledge,
there is no one in
the Army fit to hold
a candle to him -
In this we S. & I, both agree
& we are quite dis=
interested, because he
went against us
about Netley -

After Cooper, but a long way after him, comes Anderson, (Arthur) once P.M.O. at Balaclava, a D.I.G. now I believe. He is in China too or was - perhaps in India now - He is a very conciliatory man; a man of considerable power, but with just the contrary fault to Cooper, who is too violent, while

Anderson is too humble.

Had I been Alexander, I should have named Cooper to be Sanitary Officer to China & Anderson as his remplaçant. ~~These~~/Those ~~m~~ ought to be very serious reasons which make Alexander set aside these two men on such a hazardous public duty as this- Dr. Sutherland & I both agree in this =

II. Moorhead, the Indian Medical Professor, is come home & is at Scarbro'; to be heard of at the India Ho:

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

413

October 2012

Hampstead N W
Oct 29/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

The Queries for the **[9:98]**
Queen's troops in India
have arrived (after
a very difficult
voyage through the
Strand) at the W.O.
in Whitehall Gardens.

Dr. Sutherland will
go there, make them

up into packets &
send them to the
W.O. in Pall Mall,
as soon as you have
given the necessary
instructions for
their being forwarded
to India, filled up
& returned to you -

Shall we write you a Circular
something like the
enclosed for the

three Officers Commanding
in the three Presidencies? **[end 9:98]**

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{notes in another hand. upside down}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

414

October 2012

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale 2nd November 1859 Dr. Burrell's opinion of Lawson's letter on the Newcastle Case & Yellow Fever generally} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

2 Nov/59

Thanks very much for
Sir Gomm, who is very
interesting. We have
kept his Statistics but
return his letter, with
a comment upon it,
suggested by Lawson's
pamphlet & by poor
old Burrell, who has
sent us a very long
& interesting letter
upon ~~it~~/Lawson, which I am

afraid you would not
read. So I only send
you the juice.

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

415

October 2012

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Oct. 29- 5th Novber
1859 on the E. Indian queries} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

5 Nov/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

No orders have **[9:98-99]**
come from Pallmall to
Whitehall yet anent
the Indian Queries -
tho' Whitehall has
sent to Pallmall
every day for them/same.

If the utmost
dispatch is made,
I believe there is

reason to hope, with
a continuance of the
present favourable
weather, that the Queries
may reach Pallmall
in two months from
Whitehall.

They have only
been five months
in passing through
the India House -
not much more
than they would have
required to go to

India and back -
a circumstance
which inspires me
with the most
cheerful anticipations.

I have made
out a List of some
16 W. Indian Stations,
but do not send
it, for fear of
overpowering their/W.O.'s
administrative
abilities, till the
E. Indian ones are
gone - yours sincerely **[end 9:99]**

F. Nightingale

signed letter, 3ff, pen {in another hand: Docket} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

8 Nov/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

Both the Medical papers have got hold of your Army Medl Sch. Scheme & reproduced it *in extenso* this week, save the Programmes; the one paper without comment, the other with the most unqualified praise; "admirable"

&c "it would be difficult to suggest any improvement" &c & threatening a longer Article of praise "next week" -

It is very regrettable that they should have got hold of it before it was issued in a final "authorized" form by you; because, while laying particular (laudatory) stress upon its "having a distinct & independent existence"

"under" you, they both omit the clause about the *Indian* Medical Service & both reproduce the clause about the Senate being composed of the Professors & the *D.G.*

Now, if you think you are likely to decide upon making Martin a "Senator", in order to drag the Indians into the "Qualifi=

cations", as well as the School, would it not be very desirable *not* to let the Medical papers discuss it without so very important an addition being known? They are queer tempers & don't like to ~~turn~~/come back upon themselves -

I have had so much to do with this *confounded* profession that I am "particular" glad that these papers (which had made some very stupid remarks upon this School) are now

come to their senses -

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

I am told that the article in the U.S. Gazette, "whose" *dulness* "is shocking to me", is by Mouat - who was termed, not elegantly but truly, in the Crimea, Hall's "lick=spittle".

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale 8th Novr 1859 on the opinions of the Medical Press on the Army Medical School.}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/68

418

October 2012

{in another hand: Docket} Hampstead N W
10 Nov/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I have a "melancholy **[9:99]**
satisfaction" in congratulating you on the fact that there is an Office in this Govt worse organized than that which you have undertaken to reform. And this is the great India House -

The great house

has a head, (so they say,) but no hands - And Sir C. Wood had much better have accepted our proposal than have done what he has done, which is nothing.

We asked for no work from the overworked magnates, which we knew we should not get, but the appointment

of two good clerks, selected by Mr. Hornidge (the Head of the Statistical Dept) & paid by us - The men should have been set to work the next day & the work would have been done by this time -

As it is, nothing has been done & nothing ever will be done - as there is no organization of labor in that House,

such as Sir C. Wood
might see any day
in Yorkshire.

The fault lies with
Sir G. Clerk, not
with Sir C. Wood.
That worthy Scot has
no capacity for business,
as I believe Sir C.
Wood knows full well.
And the inaction
presided over by that
man is general.

What we want
now is for

~~for~~ Sir C. Wood to
give prompt &
peremptory orders -
i.e. orders that shall
be obeyed for
carrying out our work

Or - let him say that
they cannot (or will
not) do it. And
we are quite ready
with a plan of
operations of our own.
- independent of
them - & Clerks of
our own -

It is a cruel waste
of time - And we
might have been half
through the business
of the Commission by
now -

Mr Hornidge was
to speak yesterday
to Sir C. Wood's Secy
about it. But I
despair of anything
being done -

II - (This is another matter - the materials for which Mr. Prinsep also said did not exist at the India Ho: - but they do)

The *Forms* for the STATIONAL Returns are now ready & will be sent to Mr. Hornidge to be filled up - [end 9:99]

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

If Ld Stanley declined the [9:99] Commission, because he knew of this state of things & it bothered him, I rather admire

the man's *canniness*

One mystery I will tell ~~fr~~/gratis - The Queen's Minister, responsible to the H. of C., is not master at the E.I. Ho. - Sir G. Clerk is the Minister for India -

Let the wise man profit by this notice. [end 9:99]

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Nov 10. 59. on the state of the India House}

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Nov. 10. 1859. on Dr. Rutherford's appointment} {in another hand: Docket} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W
Nov 10/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

There is no help for Dr. Rutherford! that is clear - Neither I nor Sutherland know Dr. Thomson, of the 58th, except by reputation - Unless the 58th is going out, we neither of us think it worth while to *send* him - only for

Alexander to appoint, as second, somebody who *is* out or is going out - For Thomson is said not to be a ~~not~~ luminary, any more than Rutherford.

NB. I should exactly re-echo the words of Alexander about the one I know; viz. that he is "an excellent Officer, with tact & judgment" - But all

that does not make a Sanitary Officer -

However he is a man of good general ability - and we could name no one better.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

The amended Queen's & Barrack Regulations are gone to the Printer's.

signed letter, 1f, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale 14th Novr 1859 on the Queries for the Indian Troops & Dr. Moorhead's address} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

14 Nov/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

Morehead's the

Indian Professor's, address is:

Dr. Morehead

at Dr. McLennan's

53 Upper Harley St.

Martin's title is

"Physician to the Council of India".

The India House accepts [9:100]

with transport *your*

clerks & your

paying them - [end 9:100]

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 3ff, pen 2057/F4/68

422

October 2012

Hampstead N W
18 Nov/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

Even the offer of **[9:102]**
12/ a day (the price
of the two clerks) has
failed to move the
great house of India
to any exertion.

On Monday Dr.
Sutherland went there
& made the above

handsome proposal
viva voce - It
was accepted viva
voce - And he
was requested to
write it down
(the Indians could
not believe in
the magnificent
sum of 12/)
& address it to
Sir G. Clerk, which

he did.

Farr went there
himself yesterday
to set his two clerks
to work, who are
ready & waiting
- but was told
that Sir G. Clerk
had given no
authority.

These people
must be ordered

forthwith to supply
the information -
in their own way,
if not in ours.

Our two men
were to be employed
exclusively on the
Military Returns
(otherwise called
Muster=Rolls)

Other two Clerks
will be required
exclusively for the
Medical Returns.

Let them supply
all or two or none -
We will supply
none or two or all
& pay for all, just
as they like.

But such
stiff necked Israelites
were never to be
found in the
wilderness as in
the India Ho: **[end 9:102]**

sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale 18 Novbr. 59 on the Clerks at the India House}

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale 29th Novbr 59. on my
Army Memo:} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

29 Nov/59

Thank you very much
for letting me see
it.

It is a most
statesman-like paper
& shews what you
are -

It is monstrous
that, in times of trouble,
the foreigner, who is

not allowed to recruit
men in England
should be able to
recruit machines
of war, which are
now of so much
more importance -

This is the
cleverest charlatan
the world has ever
seen -

A man of the
"Institut", (which
always calls him

"the rascal,") writes to
me about him ~~which~~/whereof
the enclosed is a
scrap -

F. Nightingale

{enclosed letter from Paris about conditions there}

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W
Dec 28/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

In order to carry out
the new Regulation that
soldiers' sick wives &
children are to be
treated & *dieted* in
Hospital, *where there*
is Hospital accomm=
dation for them, I have been
collecting the numbers
of "constantly sick" ~~from~~
who will require accommodation

from

the different Stations
thro' the Barrack
Commission -

As you will see
the results in their
General Report, and
as you will be "strongly
advised" to give the
order to put up huts
for the women's temporary
accommodation, till
permanent Hospital
accommodation can
be provided, I am

not going to trouble you
about that now -

But at *Devonport*
the numbers are so
startling that - do
you think you would
at once give the order,
which is all that is
required, to put up
two ordinary Barrack
huts (or at least *one*)
- they hold twelve -
in the enceinte, i.e.
within discipline; ~~where~~

there is said to be
 plenty of room for two
 huts & more? It
 would be simply the
 cost of labor in putting
 them up - the huts mate=
 rials being there - And the "wives"
 are then brought within the Regulation.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

The case is so pressing
 that the Devonport Army
 Surgeon wrote to me for
 private relief for them,
 without in the least
 knowing that the thing
 was going to be done generally.

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Decbr 28.59. Urges the immediate Erection of
 2. Huts for the wives of the Soldiers at Devonport where the sickness & mortality
 are too terrible to "wait".

initialed letter, 3ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Jany 28.60 Paget's
 opinion of the new Army Medical School.} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead N W

Jan 28/60

[15:287-88]

Dearest

I am overjoyed to
 hear that you are
 going to Wilton for
 Sunday - And I shall
 stay & celebrate the
 occasion here.

Will you say to
 him

1. that Alexander is
 obviously quite wrong
 about the "Serjeant
 Major at Fort Pitt"

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

427

October 2012

tho' the tone of Taylor's
letter is very unbecoming
- but, confidentially,
had I been Taylor, I
should have been
just as furious -
The idea of preferring
the stores to the
Lunatics - when, too,
it is better not to say
how many are the
(unprevented) suicides
in our Army Hospitals.

I am afraid the
transaction also

shews how *hugger=mugger*
are the ways of going
on still at that
D.G.'s Office - these
matters of administra=
tion Mr. Herbert
specially put into
a special branch -
And now, here is
Logan, as *Senior*
in rank merely,
administering them
during Alexander's
absence, when they
are not in his
branch at all!

2. that in a letter I
have just had from
Paget (the Surgeon
& E.I. Co. Examiner)
(about Civil Hospital
Statistics,) he
establishes, as to
the Army, two
important points
(1) that he is well
satisfied with the
class of men who
now come forward
to be examined
for Medical (Army)
Commissions

(2) that they very
much want
farther schooling
& (3) he concludes
with saying that,
when the Army
Medical School
is established, there
will not be such
another Public
Service in the
world for efficiency
as our Army
Medical Service.

This is the more

important as coming
from *Paget*, ~~as he~~
~~is~~ a "St. Bartholomew's"
man. ever yours

F.N.

I was so ashamed
not to be able to
~~come~~ get up
on Sunday to see
Mr. Herbert - But
I *let him come*
for the ride's sake

[end 15:288]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

429

October 2012

signed letter, 5ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale April 14.60 on the arrangement of the new Hospital at the Cape
.} 2057/F4/68

30 Burln St.

London W

April 14/60

no answer

Dear Mr. Herbert

You are going to have a Sanitarium at the Cape for the "sick & wounded" from China & India of from 600 to 1000 beds - with a regular transport service from India & China to the Cape.

About half will be serious cases - And the D.G. says it will be "a second Scutari" (he does not mean in disorder but in importance.)

The D.G. intends to bring forward the proposal at a W.O. Meeting on Monday, (?) - present the C. in C. - for organizing this General

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Hospital (or Sanitarium)
upon the new
"Regulations", qua
Governor, qua Nurses
&c &c

430

October 2012

Of all this, you
will say, you need
not inform me.

My point is this:
the D.G. does not
seem to clearly to
understand, (even
with his "Regulations"
before him,) that
the appointment of
the Governor is in
the hands of the S.
of S., (vide Page 40,)
- also of the Sup. Genl
of Nurses, (vide P.
47.)

He says that,
since the promulgation
of the "Regulations",
the C. IN C. has
appointed a Governor
to the Yarmouth Hospital,

-2-

"who has done
exceedingly ill."
The D.G./~~He~~ is anxious
for the introduction
of Female Nurses
& is looking about
for ~~them~~/some, as if he
were Matron, as
well as D.G.

[Mrs. Shaw Stewart
is now in England,
serving at King's
College Hospital. I

have no doubt she
would accept a
temporary appointment
at the Cape - And
I think her much
better suited for
such foreign service
than for home. It
would also not
compromise you to
anything further]

But this is a
point of minor
importance -

P.S. -3-
Hospital Huts for
600 are to be sent
out from home to
the Cape - And I
should be rather glad,
(Mr. Herbert volente)
to have my "finger in
the pie" of their
structural arrangements.

Galton is in France
till Tuesday.

All my information
comes through Sir G.
Grey (Cape)

We have put up
the D.G. to reading
his own "Regulations".

My object in now
troubling you (among
so many greater
troubles) is that the
Cape is a place
where it is essential,
in Sir G. Grey's estimation,
to organize a really
efficient General
Hospital, because

1. it is so far from home that constant reference cannot be made to home.

2. every thing has to be organized there

3. it is likely to be a large & permanent establishment, from the fineness of the climate & other reasons.

[How I should like to be going out to have the doing of the female part of it!]

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand; Miss Nightingale April 30. 60. on the case of Dr. Becher} 2057/F4/68

30 O. B. St.

April 30/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

You wished to have some Memo of Alexander's intentions with regard to Dr. Becher -

I enclose a letter of Lord Belper's (with his permission) to the governess of his children, who is Dr.

Becher's sister.

It contains a clear statement of Becher's case -

The only question is as to the Diploma. He will be registered & will therefore comply with the Act which requires Army Doctors to be registered. His *Tübingen* qualifications are sufficient for all practical purposes.

Alexander intended to date his services 6 years back, which is 6 years of life - This should be done -

If it cannot be done without a Diploma, Becher would get one at once. But it is quite unnecessary to exact it, so far as the security of the Service is concerned.

Would you be good enough ~~as~~ to let me

have Lord Belper's letter back, as I mean to make use of it with the Medical Council?

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

The Bechers are a family of extraordinary talent from Württemberg. And Miss B., the governess, is an instance of my theory, contrary to all the "Women's Rights" folk, that a really educated woman can command *any* salary.

{the letter mentioned follows}
P.S.

Sir James Clark says there will be no difficulty in "registering" Becher. But there may be some delay till the next Council sits.

He earnestly hopes Becher may be sent out by next mail - & the Commission be sent after him - which must wait for the Registration.

FN, unsigned memorandum, 3ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale May 1860 on Dr. Becher's Appointment & Services} 2057/F4/68

Dr. Emil Becher

Pathologist at Scutari
& in China -
(whose maps of
Hong Kong & Sanitary
Report of Victoria
Mr. Herbert saw
here -)

On going to the A. Ml. Dep.
to learn Mr. Herbert's
decision on his case,
he was told by one of
the Junior Officers that
Mr. Herbert had decided
that he was to be
admitted to the Service,

provided the Director=Genl
were satisfied with his
qualifications - viz. a
degree, diploma and
examination.

Believing that ~~J. M~~
that Mr. Herbert's
decision has been
mis=interpreted to
mean that, after five
years' of great services
to this country, (in
Acting Assistant Surgeon's
rank,) during which
he shewed talents
which were profited
by ~~t~~ in the whole

Department, in which
it is acknowledged
that there is not a
single man to match
him - (no Army Medl
Officer ~~has~~/having produced
either any Sanitary
report to compare
with his on Hong Kong)
- I can hardly suppose
that it can be meant
that Dr. Becher is
merely to receive
permission to enter
the Dept., as one of
the common public,
by the same door

that any other of the
common public may
enter (without permission)
who have neither
served the country
nor proved their
talent in long service.

Dr. Becher would
rather go out at once
to China in his original
capacity as Acting Asst
Surgeon than remain
here till July & have
all his service counted
for nothing.

Can anything further
be done in his case?

The conclusion of
Dr. Becher's whole matter
is this:

he would wish, *either*
way, i.e. whether he is
to go to *China* or to
Chatham, some *written*
security that his past
service will be counted.

Otherwise he doubts
about entering our
Service.

May 8/60

signed letter, 8 ff, pen 2057/F4/68

30 Old Burlington St
London W
Sept 3/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

On the 1st I had a letter
from the Professors of the A.M. School
- quite desperate.

The authority for the "Instrument
Money" had not (then) come.

Ten of the Students had
arrived. They stared at
the bare walls & at the absence
of all arrangements for their
work (in the new buildings) &
concluded "the School was a
hoax."

It is most unfortunate
for the first impression must
have a serious effect upon the

future of the School.

Were a letter to appear in the "Lancet" from one of these young men, stating the simple facts of the case, it would do more to damage the School, & to turn public opinion against it, than would take years to redeem.

Whatever haste is now made, the beginning must be under great disadvantages.

You will observe the information applies, not merely to the absence of the Instruments, but ~~to~~/of the fittings.

It is really too much.

Altho' this School is but a small matter, it is just a type & a climax of the working of the whole Office. And it is well it has happened - For "dirty rags shew which way the wind blows".

Unless something is done, the School will be (what the "Dy News" truly says Sir Jas: Graham's Report is) a "disgraceful failure".

The estimates for the fittings of ~~for~~ the "practical rooms" & for the "Instruments" were sent in early in April. [The whole sum was a mere trifle]-

1. Sir J. Burgoyne's minute, that the "authority of the Treasury had been received" for the former was dated August 17!!!

Col. Williams says it will take two months to put them up. Capt. Galton says he can do it in one - And

the School must open on Oct. 2.
2. After you had left London, on
August 21, I found that nothing
at all had been done about the
"authority for the Instrument Money"
-- that it had been sent to the
Tower(!), where the answer was
that they had no "instruments",
- to Woolwich (!!) where the answer
was that they had only guns,
-- to the D.G.'s Office, where it
had lain for months &c &c &c

I asked Capt. Galton to hunt it up & to take
it to Mr. Drewry (Sir B. Hawes's
absence is a God=send - at
least Mr. Drewry does *something*)
& authorize it upon the
"Sanitary vote". which Mr.
Drewry did, stipulating that
you were to know nothing about

it. (what a way of doing things!!!) A week then elapsed,
which was the time it took
for it to go to Sir E. Lugard's
Office, (as I understood) -

Certain it is that, yesterday
the Professors had not yet
received the "authority", altho'
they twice went to Mr. Milton
about it, learning what was
going on - at Mr. Drewry's.

The School *must open* on
October 2. (for the whole number
of young men.)

People talk of my "terrible
& unprecedented experience
of the inefficiency" in the Crimea
-I say my "terrible &

extraordinary experience of
the inefficiency" in the W. Office
during the last 4/four years -
No one would believe it
who had not seen it.

The intentions of the
Secretary of State are no
more carried out than
if he were at Timbuctoo -

- The 1. slowness
2. inefficiency
3. extravagance in
administration
4. want of unity

are beyond all belief.

ever yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Private I have been thinking a
great deal about Hawes's
successor -

But, as Asst Under Secy,

I do believe that Galton is
your man: In an Office like
the W.O., which has to deal
with innumerable *practical*
scientific questions, it is
essential that there should be
some one to hold in check
the Departmental opinions.
The S. of S. cannot, in many
cases, even hear an opposite
opinion. Galton is a soldier, a first-rate R.E., and has, above
all things, had more than
three years' training in these
matters. The Under Secretary

is (and probably must be) personally unacquainted with these matters, and his decision, however good a business man he might be, would be mere hap-hazard.

If Galton would accept such a tiresome & laborious office, he would do ~~it~~/the *Assistant=Under=Secyship* well - And the only man fit to succeed him is Major Gordon, (now at Constantinople)

2. You told me that you were thinking of having Col: Simmons home - I have always heard that he was the only man fit for Col: St. George's place ~~at~~/on the *Select Committee*, if you put St. G. elsewhere.

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Sep.3.1860 on the delays in the Medical School}

signed letter, black-edged paper, 2 ff, pen 2057/F4/68

30 Old Burlington St

May 26/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

This is only to say **[9:103]**
that I had a message from Lord Stanley (we are not on "speaking terms"!) to the effect that he would be very glad to know if you had time

to attend to the
Indian Sanitary
Commission -
whether you had
Meetings now
& how it was
going on - &
that he would
be very glad
to offer himself
as Chairman
(!) if you found
you had no

time to do it
yourself -

I have not
answered this -
Perhaps it was
only a compli=
mentary message,
in the same way
as "the weather"
& "your health" -

Don't trouble
yourself to answer
this -

But I thought

it my duty to
tell you that
that queer
individual
had laid
himself open
to an offer -

[end 9:103]

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale May 26.1860 on Ld Stanley's having at last
volunteered to take the Chairmanship of the Indian Sanitary Commission}

I have enquired into
Dr. Becher's alleged
neglect of his patients
on board the "Caduceus"
coming home from Hong=
Kong.

He was put in
charge of 93 sick, of
whom 40 severe &
9 dying cases. [These
died before they reached
Sincapore-]

He was unable to
stand from Fever &

was the only Medical
Officer on board.

He had, besides,
soldiers' wives &
children under his
care - Accusation {in a box}

1. The nine dead
were not reported
officially, as they
ought to have been,
by him.

2. Also, the soldiers'
wives complained to
the Captain's wife,
that they were
neglected -

This seems the
sum of the accusation.

If Becher was to blame for accepting "charge", some one was much more to blame for putting a sick man in charge, & in such a charge.

Dr. Taylor of Chatham, said "they packed off all their sick & dying with Dr. Becher."

Three Orderlies were all he had for 93 sick.

No preserved vegetables were sent, tho' they were entered

on the List, as having been sent on board.

Dr. Becher's earnest wish is still "to be sent back to China", "his service to be counted."

But, if this should be contrary to the Commander-in-Chiefs wish (C. in C. be hanged!) this is me, not Becher _____

Dr. Becher is perfectly willing to go to Chatham to

-2-

serve there, as a
Probationer, till
next Examination
(July.)

We, your petitioners,
only humbly pray
that he should be
gazetted, *ante-dating*
his Commission five
years back - *if* he
passes .

This is but just
to one to whose great
services we can all
bear witness.

And, without

some reliable
assurance of this sort,
he would not wish
to enter the Service.

For, certainly, if
there came a new
Secretary of State,
who "knew not Joseph",
"Joseph" would not
get his five years
of life accounted
to him.
May 8/60

-3-

Dr. Becher earnestly hopes that, if the story of the voyage is to weigh against him, (altho' merely as an unfavourable impression,) ~~that~~ the accusation may be brought against him openly & officially, so that he may be able to bring forward evidence on the other side & defend himself -

This, I think, would be but fair.

No "Confidential Reports!"

Private

Capt. Galton says that there is a man in the Office (I suppose he means Mapleton) who maligns Becher out of pure opposition - and that the story ~~abo~~/against him/Becher was collected by him.

Certainly I never saw a man whose attention to his Patients was more widely known and acknowledged. At Scutari he used to do the work of half the other "fellows" as they said for them.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

446

October 2012

4ff, Woolwich, 17 September, 1860 letter from three Artillery Surgeons complaining that they are to be compelled to purchase new Surgical Instruments at their own cost} 2057/F4/68

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Sep. 2. 1860. enclosing the Memo: of the Artillery Surgeons compelled to purchase new Surgical Instruments at their own cost} 2057/F4/68

Hampstead NW

Sept 22/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

You will wonder what all this is about. There is "insurrection in the Camp." And 15 old "fogies", with families, Surgeons=Major & Surgeons of the R.A., are in open revolt about their stupid costly

instruments.

They wrote to Mr. Headlam, who is out of England, I believe.

These papers were sent to me - And, to save you trouble, I have made an Abstract of the real rules of the case -

I think it is a grievance -

The tone of their

letter to Mr. Headlam
is ugly, but you
will not mind
that - If you think
right to interfere,
you will of course,
write to the D.G.
(or other Official)
direct & not
through me - or
with any reference
to me

yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

I am sorry you must come
back so soon.

initialed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Decber 5.60
mentions Ld Stanley's wish to serve on the Indian Sanitary Commission}
2057/F4/68; another letter, different content, of same date to EH 43396 f89

Dec 5/60

Dearest **[9:104]**

Lord Stanley
volunteers to say
that his University
Comm. work is done,
and, if asked by
Mr. Herbert to
take the Presidency
of the Indian
Sanitary Commn,
concerning the

progress of which
he has been making
enquiry, he would,
(I suppose) "think
about it."

Lord Stanley
is quite beyond
my comprehension.
And I would
not even have
conveyed this
message (which
is the "third

time of asking"
 from Ld S.) to
 Mr. Herbert - had
 it not been that
 the present
 necessity to
 relieve him
 from as much
 work as possible
 makes any
 loop=hole right
 to speak about,
 at least - **[end 9:104]**
 ever your F.

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: May/59 Miss Nightingale Sir R. Vivian's
 opinion of Col David Russell - Indian Commission} 2057/F4/68

West Hill Lodge
 Highgate Rise N
 May 13/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I wish that Sir John **[9:86]**
 Lawrence would answer,
 which he was to do
 today, but he has
 not yet -

Thro' Sir R. Vivian
 who, whatever his
 prejudices, is as honest
 & anti jobbing as
 Lawrence himself,
 I have tried to get

opinions on the *general*
 merits of ~~some~~ of the
 Queen's Officers (who
 have been named) from
 some of the old Indian
 Officers at the India
 Ho. One & all agree
 that Greathed is fit
 for nothing - I tell
 this for what it is
 worth - I know not -
 [I have heard Lord
 W. Paulet & other

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Officers of high standing
in the Crimea, without
as much judgement
as your little Mary,
say the same thing
of Storks, & others
who certainly had
some (i.e. judgment)]

449

October 2012

~~The~~ man most
highly spoken of by
Sir Rob. Vivian & Co:
~~others~~ is
Col. David Russell CB.
Inspecting Field Officer
Recruiting Dept.
Horse Guards

long in India - in
command of a Regt;
& a very good (Queen's)
Officer - [It may be
that his name will
turn up on Airey's or some
body else's recommen=
dation.] **[end 9:86]**

The Scotch
Inspections began
yesterday.

Sincerely yours
F. Nightingale
Please thank Mrs. Herbert
very much for her letter.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
2057/F4/68 signed letter, 8ff, pen

450

October 2012

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale, 1 Jan. 1859. Indian Sany Comm.}

Gt Malvern
1/1/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I think, with you,
that you must use
Lord Stanley's proposal;
when it comes, as a
lever to get the
Regulations & the
Council. But there
will be much
preliminary work
to do in preparing
the ground for your

Indian enquiry. I
should, if I were
you, accept first,
when Lord Stanley
writes, & then put
in the lever. If Ld
S. understands
that you must &
will have the Army
matters settled
before you move,
he will then give
Genl. Peel a little
shove -

But, as the

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Regulations & Council
will go on moving
thro' the War Office,
till they have a
Corporal of Sappers
& Miners, a Hospital
Serjeant, & a
Purveyor's Clerk
sitting upon you,
with an Apothecary's
boy in the chair, -
- I bet you a penny
that the Indian
enquiry is all done,
which will take

451

October 2012

at least three years
(interim Reports, &
interim action
having been set a
going in the mean
time) *before the*
other - Genl Peel
can't manage his
subordinates &
Lord Stanley can -

2. With regard
to the Commissioners -
Lord Stanley asked
whether the former
Commission, *minus*
Andrew Smith, would

do. I left it to you
to answer that
question - My
impression being
that, except
Alexander &
Sutherland, you
found them heavy
in hand.

What would you
think of having
those two again -
(Alexander for his
own instruction -)
3. Martin, who is

necessary for his
Indian knowledge -
4. Farr, without whom
the Statistics would
be with difficulty
done - as he has
Clerks - & Tulloch
& Balfour have not
an idea of doing
figures, except with
their own pens -
Does it not seem
to you essential to
have one Indian
Military Engineer?

& one Indian Military
Officer? If desirable
to have members
of the Indian Council,
Sir Proby Cautley
might do for the
first & Sir Richard
Vivian for the second.
But, Ld Stanley
volunteered to say
that there was not
one member on the
Council who knew
anything about
Sanitary things or
how to spell the word,

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
& specially instanced
Sir P. Cautley as
prominent in ignorance.
In this, Ld S. differs
from Mr. Martin,
who gives them rather
a good character.

I did not press,
for I did not feel
sure of what you
might think about
having a member of the Council on.

Col. Goodwyn,
Bengal Engineers, now
at home, bears a
very high character.
Lt. Col Waugh, Bengal
Engineers, Surveyor=

General of India,
now in India, is
I suppose, the first
Topographer in Europe
[That is Irish] Would
you think it well
to make enquiries
about these men?
[It might be as
impossible to let
Col. Waugh as Lord
Canning come home - That
I don't know]-

With regard to
Balfour as Secretary.
It might be difficult

to find a better man.
To have a man who
knows ~~much~~/more of India
would have advantages
& also disadvantages.
He would be prejudiced.
Balfour is not a little
in that line too, however.
His great value lay
in having materials
in his possession of
so much value, of
which he did not
know the value before.
[There would not
be this for India.]

I think it would be
worth while to see
what they have got
at the India House
that would do as a
Secretary, tho' very
likely to return to
Balfour -

I should like to
know whether you
decide for or against
a man of the Indian
Council to be on
the Commission.

NB Lord Stanley

told me that Lord Canning insisted upon large masses of troops as necessary at Allahabad - and objected to having them at Dagshai, Kupowlie, &c, our hill stations - Now it so happens that Allahabad stands highest but one of all our Stations in Mortality - ~~125~~/115 per 1000 - To decide what can be done to make unhealthy stations healthy

will be the aim of your Commission. It does not require Tulloch to tell us that troops will be healthy, if removed to healthy Stations - But, if it be necessary for our holding of India to have numbers at a place with a loss of 11-1/2 per cent - can you conceive our holding India at such a price?

3. Lord Tweeddale's tables are interesting - But that is all - they give the clue to a case to be enquired into. His own note, as shewing the advance in good principles of Military economy is far more interesting- Tho' he did the thing, I don't believe he would have written that note a year ago. You have not laboured in vain.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66

456

October 2012

I have an old note
from Lord Rokeby,
using, in the matter
of day=rooms, exactly
the self=same words
Lord Tweeddale
reproaches the
Governor General &
C. in Chief with
using - qua Barracks.

sincerely yours

F. Nightingale

Do you know John
Stuart Mill? a
most intelligent

but very odd man,
now at liberty. He
did the foreign
relations at the
India House - Sir
Geo. Clark the others.
Perhaps this would
prevent his being
useful as a
Commissioner in the
way you want -
What the Times
said of him was
quite unfair.

Wiltshire 2057/F4/68 signed letter, 6ff, pen

Gt Malvern

Jan 4/59

[15:277-78]

Dear Mr. Herbert

Hawes is really
too bad about the
Medical Council - &
what is worse, I am
afraid that Alexan-
der is giving way.

He is so good an
administrator that
he does not see
the value of organi=

zation - or has
forgotten it -

As there are
striking & original
views ~~now~~ of English
history now to be
found only in the
Prayer book, in
Burke's Peerage &
in Mrs. Shaw Stewart
- so there are striking
& original ways of
doing business, now

only to be found in
the War Office -

To strike a blow
at these ways of
doing business in
one direction was
quite as much the
object of your
"Instructions" to the
Med. Council, as to
organize the Medl
Dir. Genl's Office.

This I am not
surprised at

Alexander not
seeing.

For the R. Commn,
after attaching so
much value to the
Sanitary & Statistical
elements, to allow
them to be put second,
would be literally
for its right hand
not to know what
its left hand doeth.
The Medical Councillor
I would gladly leave

-2-

to work his own way,
were it not that
there is a "Professional
Assistant" now &
must be - And he
may as well be
organized too -

That the War Office
does not like the
"Instruction" I can
well believe. They
are in opposition
to all its ways -

I hear that
Mapleton is virtually

now "Professional Assistant". This will not do.

Without your "Instructions" to the Council there had better be no Council. And without the quinquennial appointments, there can be no independence -

As, after all the ransacking, *only*

one Sanitary & one Statistical man has been found - but five or six Medical members have been named, it will not do to give the former lower pay than the latter.

If Hawes likes to call it a board, that does not signify. But without the Instructions, the

{in another hand: 4 Jan 1859}
Department would have no strength, nor the D.G. any aid in specialties. Rather than Hawes's plan, let Alexander go on as he is, ~~don't~~/do not ~~however~~ you think so? The "Westminster" Article reads very well - don't you think so? There are two or three

-3-

misprints - In
describing the 8
Depts of Genl Hospls,
you had put "and
none to nurse" - It
is printed "and
one to nurse." I
think there is no
other which signifies.
But the Revise (in
which ~~these~~/ey all are),
should have been
corrected -

I see you have nailed
your colors to the
mast in the Initials.

It is gratifying to
see Mr. Gladstone
has been snubbing
the Church in Zante.
As Milton's devil
laughed & made
faces to himself,
as soon as out of
Eden, so I think
Mr. Gladstone must

have done - May he
come home with
the 7 Islands in a
neat bracelet on
his wrist for
Britannia!

The "Morning Star",
a penny paper, has
being going against
us. This is too bad.
I believe its circula=
tion is very large -
I must go out
with the hounds

again. Have you
seen one *in green*?
I sent one to Belgrave
Sq. in that coat.

I was not at all
the worse for the
journey, thank you.
But I have not
been up since I came -
So you may hear I
was -

[end 15:278]

Did you think of
a Queen's Officer for
the Indian Commission?
sincerely yours F. Nightingale.

signed letter, 4ff, pen

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Jan. 29 1859 Statistical Commission suggests
Sanitary Engineering Lectures for Cadets & that Galton be the future head of the
Barrack Depart.}

Gt Malvern
Jan 29/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I can hear nothing
about the Indian
Organization Commisn,
except that it is to
have two contending
Reports, (as you
anticipated), i.e. as far as
regards the description
of troops to be employed -
Probably you may
know more -

The great Actuaries

have taken us up,
which is the more
pleasing, as the
Great Actuary, had
put us down, which
was distressing. Here
is their "Post Magazine"
[The Article was not,
I know, written by Farr]

I invite Mrs.
Herbert's attention
to ~~the~~ a new view of
the object of the
Institution of Infancy;
vide next Article -

"the life duration of
"tender babies (such
a word!) is the most
"delicate test" - Saturn
as an Analytical
Chemist with two
"tender babies" in a
glass tube!

Sutherland told
me, you wished to
know "whether the
Daily News Sanitary
articles came from
Malvern" - I did not
write them - but I
supplied the materials,

& wrote the heads, on
 condition the writer
 should not mention
 it to the Editor - The
 name of the writer
 I hardly dare mention
 in your presence - You
 will see by some
 blunders, innocent
 & non-innocent,
 that the subject is
 a new one - There are
 to be three more - (not blunders but)
 Articles - The Medical times
 has two Articles, one
 on your Article, one
 on your Commission -

Since the Gunpowder
 plot is come out of
 the Prayerbook, I feel
 ready to put it under
 the War Office.

I hear that Alexander
 is dispirited & irritable
 & is writing to you -

One used to think
 that good might be
 done to the War Office
 from without - But
 now it seems evident
 that it is *all bureau*,
 corrupt to the core -
 that your Commission

raised only a morsel
 of its shroud - &
 that it must
 have *its own* Minister
 to reform it root
 & branch - & make
 the dry bones live.
 Nothing short of
 this, it seems, will
 do it any good - Certainly
 Genl Peel will not.

I wish there
 could be some system
 set on foot to have

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Sanitary Engineering
lectures for the
Engineer Cadets. And
I wish that Galton
might be future
Head of the Barrack
Department, vice Laffan.

464

October 2012

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

Farr & I are doing
a system of uniform
Hospital Statistics
for the world, to be
proposed at the
Statistical Congress

next time, after
which we mean
to introduce it in
the Universe, Saturn
excluded, because
I don't approve his
system about babies.

F.N.

signed letter, 2ff, pen {in another hand: Miss Nightingale Feb 10. 1859 "Where
are the Regulations?"} 2057/F4/68

Gt Malvern

Feb 10/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

Would you not
think well to ask
Genl Peel where the
"Regulations" are?
It is said they have
passed the Purveyor's
Clerks' Committee at
the War Office (wonderful celerity
if they have!) They
must then be nearly

ready by this time -
And you ought to
see what has
been doing on them
by the Purveyors' Clerks
& Co.

Alexander says
that, on his appoint=
ment as D.G., Sir
H. Storks said to
him, "No Council,
remember!" Considering

Storks signed the Report, if this is not dishonest, what is it? - Perhaps then Storks' departure may lessen the opposition - But, whatever they choose to call (or not call) the Council, we must have the Instructions.

Yours sincerely
F. Nightingale

signed letter, 2ff, pen

{in another hand: 12 April 1859 F. Nightingale Indian matters 1859} 2057/F4/68

30 Old Burlington St
London W
April 12/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I am afraid you [9:78]
will think me over
busy. But you cannot
think how that Indian
business has lain at
my heart - After you
were gone, I wrote to
Lord Stanley (quite
tame, believe me: but
I repeated what he
had said last Dec.ber

without preamble)

And this is his answer:

the oddest thing of all,

I think - Don't destroy

it, please. *J'y tiens* - et

pour cause.

[end 9:78]

I understand

Balfour has accepted

the Statistical with

£300 a year *plus* the

Asylum - which he

keeps - But I only

heard this second=

hand -

Will you be so good

[8:660]

as to tell your Nurse,

or whomsoever you may

please, to write to me,

when Mrs. Herbert's

seventh is arrived?

[end 8:660]

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

I hope "the clergy" will

forgive you - You have

a great deal of

"Xtianity" to fall back

upon.

unsigned letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

April 18/59

30 O. Burlington St

Dear Mr. Herbert

I cannot think

how I could be so

careless, if I did

not tell you that

your packet of

Army Medical School

was received here

on Friday last -

that I looked it

all through - & sent

it by a messenger within

three hours to the
War Office - having
added the three
copies - addressed
to Genl Peel -

Unless his private
Secretaries minute
each other in descending
gradation down to
the porter's boy,
before he sees any
thing, I cannot
conceive how he has

not seen it.

I have heard **[9:79]**
nothing from Lord
Stanley - whom however
I gratified (not with
the sight but) with
the substance of
your note. I was
rather in hopes
that he would have
written to you. I did
not expect to hear
from him. Because,
I think, he is angry
(notwithstanding his

mansuetude) - which
doesn't signify, as, if
he will but do this
one thing, I am very
sure never to want
anything from him
again - Lord Stanley
is a kind of Robinson
Crusoe of humanity
{upside down} ~~Dear Sir John Would~~
He has no fellow=
creatures. He never

communicated with
anybody, nor anybody
with him on any
subject that I ever
heard of. He is a
species *in himself* -
& will be described,
as such, by any
future Cuvier.

Genus...Homo

Species - Lord Stanley **[end 9:79]**

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Yours sincerely
{signature cut off}

469

October 2012

signed letter, 4ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Mrs. Howitt's
West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise N.
April 20/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

I Enclosed I send, **[9:79]**
the List of Commissioners,

II Heads for the
Instructions, to
which I hope
you will add
a great deal - **[end 9:79]**
And pray don't
let him settle

the Instructions
finally, without
referring them
again back to
you -

III A List of a few **[9:79]**
of the "documents

"which we want,
"if they can be
"obtained from
"the India Ho:"

IV A List of good
witnesses, which
you *don't* want

now - Only perhaps

Ld S. will say

there are none

to be had - [end 9:79]

I will write

tomorrow, if anything

more occurs to me -

And for this I

keep Ld S.'s letter

till tomorrow, when

I will send it you.

[You could not

make use of this

Commission, could you?

to get anything more

out of Peel ~~about~~/towards

our Army Medical

Council, or ~~Regulations~~

getting out the

Regulations, of which

we have heard nothing.]

With regard to

these Instructions,

I am sure a great

deal more will

occur to you - So let

them be as ample

as possible - pray -

yrs sincerely

F. Nightingale

It occurred to me, [9:79]

what should you

think of Col. Sir W.

Russell, M.P., for the

"Queen's man"? Probably

you know him - But,

if not, he is a man

of about poor

Stafford's calibre -

with zeal & generosity,

without sense or

judgment, but

without Stafford's
tendency to gross
exaggeration - He
has enthusiasm,
a quality something
scarce on your
Commissn. He would
follow you & not
be obstinate. He
has Indian experience now.
And I suppose it
is rather a good thing

to have a M.P., is
it not? He is a
Cavalry Officer, which
is a bad thing.
I knew him in
the Crimea. For an
Army man, he is
wonderfully "go ahead",
& would astonish
the old Indians out
of their ruts. **[end 9:79]**

F. Nightingale
April 28/59 Turn Over

Brigadier Greathed, **[9:80]**
the man of the won=
derful march from
Delhi to Agra (?)
is come home - He
is a first=rate soldier
& a good Indian
name - Would he
do? It is sometimes
better to begin on a
"table rase", like
this Russell or
Greaded. They have
no prejudices. **[end 9:80]**

nothing to do with it, (considering
the men who have been
selected for his Councillors,)
farther than finding Medical
Officers for the service]

- III. There will be four sources of
evidence
1. existing documents & maps
 2. witnesses
 3. inquiries by forms of questions
to be filled up & returned
with & skeleton maps & plans
 4. evidence taken on the spot.
- The Report, drawn up from
these, will be complete in
itself and a book of reference
for all future Military
Engineering & Medical
operations.
Forms, tables, diagrams, maps,
(especially disease maps &
physical geography maps)
recommendations, plans for
improving old & constructing
new stations will make it

(what it should be) a practical
Manual for our occupation of India.

{in another hand: Ap./59 Miss Nightingale Indian Commission - Preliminary work -
& Commission work -}

signed letter, 4ff, pen {in another hand; Ap/59 Miss Nightingale, Indian Commission as to Sir E. Lugard, Sir J. Burgoyne. Col. Kennedy, Genl Tremenheere, Lord Gough, Sir W. Russell, Col. Greathed}

West Hill Lodge
Highgate Rise
N.

April 28/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

For a "Queen's Officer" [9:80]
on the Indian Sanitary
Commn it is much
easier to say whom
not to have than
whom to have - But:

1. Sir E. Lugard - to educate?
able & honest -
not independent -
(but what Army
man is?) with
Indian experience.
2. Sir J. Burgoyne - a
faithful friend of
the Sanitary cause,
his rank would
help - not a
wise man - no
Indian experience
3. Col. Kennedy. Ass. Q.M.G.
at Aldershot -
very highly thought
of by all good
Army men - has
Indian experience.

It is true the man
ought to be an Engineer
But no Queen's Engineer
has been in India till
the War -

And *all* these men
know just this of
India to recommend
& no more. "If you
want to make the
soldier healthy in
India, take him
out of it."

Therefore you will
have to educate
your man any how,
& I had rather
educate Sir E. Lugard. **[end 9:80]**

I am sorry the
Military part of the
team musters so
strong. But you will

drive it.

If you could look
over the Queen's
Officers who gave
evidence before the
"Indian Colonization
Committee" & the
"Army Indian Re=
Organization" Commissn
(if the last be out)
there might be one
with common sense -
Major=Genl Tremenheere's
evidence was good. He has
great experience -
But he is E.I.C. I think

If you thought well
to write to Airey for
a List of Officers
who knew the Stations
well in India, ~~I~~/we
could get this list
sifted for you (privately)
in London - But
the fact is the men
are all alike.

Do you know old
Gough? [I like him.]
His name would be
unexceptionable - he
is a rough creature
but good -

[I wish we had Sir
Colin. He is such a
shrewd man of sense.]

This is all I have
to suggest. Sir J. Mc
Neill's opinion of
Lugard is high.

I have a great
deal to say about
the preliminaries -
anent the questions
to be sent out to
the Indian Stations,
as you suggested -

which I will do
tomorrow please -

Thank you so much **[8:660]**
for your news about
Mrs. Herbert & the
little thing. It
was like you to
write yourself &
so much - **[end 8:660]**

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

The Irish inspection **[15:283]**
is begun. They come
back on Saturday
week - **[end]**

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

476

October 2012

Highgate
April 29/59

Dear Mr. Herbert

If your mind has **[9:80]**
inclined to have Sir E.
Lugard, I conceive it
will be the best. After
making every enquiry,
I don't see anyone who
will do as well -

He has been 24
years in India - an
Adj. Gen. there - has
great local knowledge - is
unenergetic - honest
& fair. In what little

official intercourse
Galton has had with
him about your
Barrack matters -
he has been sensible.
That he is a Horse
Guards "organ" there
is no doubt. But
the Commission will
always be called
"one-sided" by its
enemies, if there is
no such "organ" - Your **[end 9:80]**
first Sanitary Commissn
would not have

been one-half so
effective, if A. Smith
had not been holding
forth on it -

If Lugard is unfair,
which however he will
not be, it will set
public opinion against
his side.

He has great
experience both in
& off the field - And
if he can be made
to concur, his concur=
rence will be more
valuable than that

of any man like Sir
W. Russell &c -

I have ascertained **[9:81]**
that no *Royal Engineer*
or *Artillery Officer*
ever went to India
before the war &
that none has as
yet returned - **[end 9:81]**

yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Ap/59 Miss Nightingale Indian Commission Sir E. Lugard
no Royal Artillery or Engineer officer was
in India before the War.}

- Chairman Mr. Herbert
1. Medical Member *Mr. Alexander*
 2. Statistical "*Dr. Farr*
 3. Sanitary {Indian *Mr. Martin*
 4. {General *Dr. Sutherland*
 5. Military Indian
 (Queen's) & Indian *Sir R. Vivian*
 Councillor
 6. Engineer Indian *Sir Proby Cautley*
 Indian Council OR *Col. Waugh*
 {Surveyor General
 {of India -IF to be had
 OR *Col. Baker*
 {Mily Secy
 {India Ho:
 [Last said to be the
 best - Could you find out?]

NB

John Stuart Mill

you thought of once.
But I think you
considered him too
much identified
with the "old" for a
Commissioner.

Engineer & Medical Officers
 who will give good evidence

Bengal Army

ENGINEERS -

In India Col. Boileau
 Lt. Col. Waugh Surv. Genl
 Major Ommanny
 Capt. C.B. Young
 Lieut. J.M. Innes
 " R. De Bourbel
 At Home Col. H. Goodwyn
 " G.T. Greene

MEDICAL

In India Surgeon Grant
 A.S. Norman Chevers
 Surg. John McClelland
 " H.M. McPherson
 A.S. Macnamara
 " Marcus Hill
 At Home Surgeon Dempster
 " K. Mackinnon
 Dr. Julius Jeffreys

Madras Army

ENGINEERS

In India Col. Cotton
 Major Lawford
 Capt. Collyer
 Lt. Col. Atkinson
 At Home Capt. Ouchterlony
 " Harsley
 " Hitchins

MEDICAL

In India Duncan McPherson
 Director General
 Surgeon E.G. Balfour
 " Maclean
 A.S. Waring
 " Francis Day
 At Home Surgeon Key
 " Geddes
 " R. Wight

ENGINEERS

In India Col. Scott
Major Crawford
Capt. Marriott
" Ballard
At Home Lt. Col. C.N. Grant
" H.B. Turner
Major Wingate
" John Hill

MEDICAL

In India Surgeon Gibson
" Collier
" Morehead
" Arnott
At Home " McLennan
" Glen
" Stovell

{in another hand: Mr. Neison Col. Sykes}

Manner of Enquiry

- 1 Examination of
Documents in
possession of the
India Ho:
regarding the
health of troops
& Stations
2. Parole evidence
from persons
on leave in
England,
acquainted
with Stations
3. Obtaining all
Maps
plans &c
which throw light
on the subject
4. Issuing printed
lists of questions
to all Stations
in India

These Documents
will ~~(illeg)~~ be wanted from
the India House

1. The best India Ho.
map of India.
2. Trigonometrical
Survey, as far as
completed.
3. List of all Military
Stations to be
marked also on
the maps.
4. Copies of all published
periodical reports
of Medical Boards
in Presidencies.
5. Copies of all
published Army
Indian Statistical
tables.

Same, Queen's troops.

6. Lists of all
places where are
permanent Barracks
& Hospitals {in another hand:

including

sanatoria.}

7. Access to
catalogue of
documents at
India Ho:, & to
all documents
there bearing on
the enquiry.

{in another hand: [I]
documents wanted
from India Ho

To ask Lord Stanley
for a general power
of examining all
documents respecting
health of Army
in India Ho:

Should Sir John
McNeill be on the
Commission?

Don't be limited
~~as~~ to any time
for finishing
the Enquiry.

{in another hand: Ap/59 Miss Nightingale Indian Commission

1. List of Commissioners
2. Heads for Instructions
3. Documents wanted
4. List of Witnesses}

signed letter, 2ff, pen 2057/F4/68

Hampstead NW
Oct 18/60

[15:383-84]

Dear Mr. Herbert

The recalcitrant
Artillery Surgeons
are still raging
about their instruments.

I think I have
heard you say that
it was an error of
administration.

Would it do to
put it right in
this way? -

As

As a certain number
of Medical Officers
of the R.A. have
already given up
the Government
Surgical instruments
and purchased others,
it would not do to
return the instruments
in any form - But
you might retain
the instruments given
back, and purchase
for Government use
those which have
been bought by the

R.A. Officers to
replace these - the
Officers retaining
them as long as
they are in the
Service & surrendering
them to the Government
when they retire -

As regards the
men who have not
yet given up their
instruments, may
these not retain
them till they
retire?

All new comers to

comply with the
new Regulations
and purchase their
own instruments.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Oct 18 1860 on the case of the Artillery Surgeons}

In re Surgical Instruments

1. The Army Med. Reg., both old & new, take it for granted that Assistt Surgeons except those of Cavalry, have no need of instruments

The old Ordnance Reg., on the contrary supplied instruments to Assist. Surgeons, to be afterwards kept up by themselves.

Thus there was a difference in the services.

2. The Army Med. Reg., both old & new, require every Surgeon of whatever designation to provide a set of instruments, according to scale. But both state that certain instruments are to be given to the Surgeon by the W.O.

The number so given is greater under the new than under the old Reg.

In the Ordnance, on the contrary, there was no such rule.

The instruments once given to the Ass. Surgeon were only to be kept up by the Surgeon, as above said.

3. Since the amalgamation of the two Services, the Ordnance has unquestionably come under the new Med. Reg.

4. The only point is one of Office administration. Should the Ordnance men have been

when the said cases were presented to them,

called on to deliver up ~~& purchase~~ cases engraved by authority with their own names, & purchase, as they have been, at the cost of £15 or £20 per man?

5. Undoubtedly the new law is better than the old. Because it ensures uniformity in the instruments. But it would have been better to let the old "fogies" retire out with their old instruments, rather than have raised all this opposition.

6. There is no hardship in applying the law to the Line. But there is a hardship in applying it to the

Ordnance. It is tantamount to a fine.

If the W.O. makes similar requirements in other branches of the Service, again, there is no hardship.

But if this is an exceptional case, it might be well to limit the new law to new comers into the Artillery.

The D.G.'s answer that there are greater advantages under the Warrant is no answer. Because all Depts. benefit by these advantages. The Artillery men only are fined. **[end 15:384]**

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen

487

October 2012

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Oct 24. 60. 2057/F4/68

Hampstead NW
Oct 24/60

[15:293]

Dear Mr. Herbert
There are rats
in the W.O. - also a
cat -

There are 17
months' minutes to
apply for 6d a week
for her -

40 minutes say
that she ought to
live on rats -

Other minutes

that she ought to
have milk - but
that 6d a week
is too much -

Others again ask
what she is to live
upon in the mean
time -

I am very
anxious to know
what is your
decision - whether
you have given
any, as yet -

whether you think
five pence, three farthings
would be too much?

I incline to
five pence, halfpenny.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

This is fact - not fiction.
But I would not
be a W.O. cat, even
for a very great deal.

[end]

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 5ff, pen

488

October 2012

Hampstead NW
Nov 3/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

*With regard to
General Hospitals.*

Certainly, it is of
the utmost importance,
as you say, to organize
these in the *Camps*.

I only mentioned
Woolwich Cape of G.H.
Portsmouth Fermoy
Plymouth Dublin

&c

because these could

be done at once -

And every day's
delay is so much
in the balance *against*
the success of the
scheme, because,
for it to work, it
should be two years
at least begun, before
you go out of office.

But Aldershot
is undoubtedly the
best place of all
for a General Hospital.
Because it would give
the additional practice

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
of carrying out General
Hospital arrangements
during field Operations
- of collecting and
removing sick in
Ambulances - &c seeing
the whole machinery
of Field General Hospls.
Aldershot is the only
camp large enough
to do this properly.
And the constant
succession of Officers
through it is an
additional advantage.

But there is no
Hospital at present

there which will do.

The one planned
(but not executed)
would do with a few
improvements. Or
a Hut Hospital
might be put up
which would answer
temporarily or for
a beginning.

Sooner or later
Aldershot must be
the great General Hospl.

Shorncliffe would
do much less well.
The Hospital is very

-2-

inconvenient - ought
to be removed
altogether - has no
administrative rooms
& no place to build
any.

If one model
General Hospital is
to be tried, certainly
Shorncliffe is not
the place -

But poor Alexander
wanted Genl Peel
to try thirteen, and
gave in the names.

And I believe he
was right - i.e. as
to organizing several
immediately.

If you determined
upon Shorncliffe as
one, it ought to be
examined with special
reference to the
required additions
and organization.

The wards are
very small - for 7
only, I think.

Your "Regulations"
regard all agglomerated
Hospitals as to be
organized as "General
Hospitals" - but not
all under a Governor.

If the expence
of having a Colonel
to each General Hospital
as Governor is feared,
let the P.M.O. be
Governor in such a
Hospital as Shorncliffe
~~with~~ which has from 200 to 250
Patients only.

He is so, in fact,

at present, as to all
 administrative &
 directing functions,
 but *not* as to any
~~of the~~ supply functions.
 The Pr. Med. Off. and
 Purveyor are in fact
 twin Governors now.

[There would be
 an average of 1500
 Patients at Aldershot]

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

I understand that Dr.
 Gibson is so convinced
 of the impossibility
 of going on as we are

-3-

now, that he is
 anxious that you
 should appoint
 "Capts. of Orderlies"
 over *districts*, even
 where there are
 no General Hospls.

And I should
 think that the
 discharged (good)
 Serjeants=Majors
 (Stewards) of the
 late Medl Staff Corps,
 (I could give you
 names of such)
 would make the

best Capts of Orderlies,
 (if a Commission
 were given them)
 whether ~~F.N.~~ for
 districts or
 Genl Hospitals.

F.N.

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Nov. 3. 1860. General Hospitals}

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
signed letter, 2ff, pen

492

October 2012

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Nov. 10. 1860. on the refusal of the Treasury to grant a Military Female Hospital}

Upper Terrace
Hampstead NW
Nov 10/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

I think the
Treasury papers, in
re Female Hospitals,
are very easily
answered.

Would you be
so good as to get
for us, from the
Purveyor in Chief,
the enclosed

information? He, I
know, possesses it.
And it would
enable us to give
the answer to the
Treasury, in case
you wished to
urge the thing.

Yours sincerely

F. Nightingale

N.B. Gentlemen
of the Treasury
don't seem to
know that, altho'

you may take a bed
 in a Civil Hospital
 by the year, (vide
 papers,) you must
 not send "Lying=
 in" cases to it ("*promiscuous*")
 which constitute
 half the whole
 of the cases, at
 least, in Soldiers'
 Wives Hospitals -
 And there are very
 few of those murderous
 Institutions, called
 "Lying=in Hospitals",
 in England, thank God!

initialed letter, 6ff, pen

{in another hand: Miss Nightingale Dec 8.60. on Major Gordon's capabilities -
 Sidney's Health.

Hampstead NW
 Dec 8/60

Dear Mr. Herbert

Major Gordon's leave
 extends for one month
 more. He has £1200
 to £1600 a year at
 Constantinople - And
 I believe there is some
 doubt as to whether
 he would accept a lower paid
 appointment at home.
 But *I* think he would

I hope you will
 not judge too hardly
 of yourself from
 these Doctors' opinions.
 Doctors get to consider
 diseases as *accidents*
 (to organs). Nothing
 can be more false -
 It is true that you
 cannot mend your
 broken leg by rest only
 or by fresh air, absence
 of anxiety &c. But
 it is *not* true that

[8:664-65]

you cannot, (sometimes)
absolutely mend a
~~broken~~ damaged organ,
almost always
keep it comfortably
going for many,
many years by
giving Nature fair
play - The presence
of a large amount
of albumen is no
test in itself of anything
but that Nature
is getting rid of
something which

ought not to be
there. Help her by
trying not to make
any more - I know
a very active
intellectual London
man, ~~of~~/now 65, whose
albuminous symptoms were
accompanied by
one, the most
advanced of all,
which you have
never had, but who
by sleeping in the
country &c &c &c
has given himself

-2-

15 years' good life
& may have 15
more -

I am not going
to bore you with a
Medical lecture -

But I do hope
you won't have
any vain ideas
that you can be
spared out of the
W.O. You said
yourself that there
was no one to take
your place - And

I don't believe there is anything in your Constitution which makes it evident that disease is getting the upper hand. On the contrary.

It would be well worth your while if you could give yourself a month's *complete* rest now - Also no rushing about.

If you could be relieved of a great deal of the detail of the W.O. ~~But~~ and the re-organization *ought* to do this - it would be well.

Did you ever think of Robt. Lowe for your Parly Under Secy? Greatly as he is disliked, I never heard anything but praise of him from his own subordinates, (i.e. the best of them) both at the Bd of Trade

& Privy Council. I have heard them speak of his fearless administrative ability with admiration.

For myself, I once applied to him to remove a great & long standing abuse at the Chelsea Hosp;, which I was able to prove - And he removed it - And that is more than can be said of any body at the W.O.

It would be an

ill wind, this, which had blown some good, if, among the changes could be that of ousting Hawes - Forgive anything which seems like impertinence

ever yours sincerely

F.N.

I am not sorry that B. Jones & Williams agreed - in order to determine on a line of action - ~~but~~/not in order to believe the case hopeless.

Note

French Returns

One must read such papers as these (about the French Army) to know what you have done for the British. In the last two years we have shot some two hundred years ahead of them.

I wish Lord Derby (or somebody) would say so in Parliament.
March 7/61 F.N.

Sir W. Jenner wrote Nightingale that he thought "a rally quite possible." e:

Wiltshire 2057/F4/66
Letter 13 March 1876, RAMC LP53/11.

498

October 2012