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Negotiating the boundaries of nursing practice

Captain Johnson, the dental officer, a quiet man, spoke next. ‘Treat for shock. Pick out any loose teeth and bits of bone then put a stitch through the tongue and tie it to a button on his jacket before you send him down the line on a stretcher’. His audience winced. Civvy nursing was never like this. These notes were probably intended for medical officers originally but they startled us into thinking objectively about the kind of nursing we might expect on active service.¹

This quotation comes from Brenda McBryde’s published memoir written nearly 50 years after the end of the Second World War. It is therefore prone both to relating the dramatic interventions required to engage a readership, and the nostalgia invoked by nurses when they considered their wartime lives. Nevertheless, it demonstrates the new surgical work that nurses expected to encounter as part of their overseas duties. Student nurses who trained between 1939 and 1945 cared for civilians injured by enemy bombing campaigns and combatants evacuated back to Britain from war zones. Thus, even before overseas posting, many nursing sisters had some experience of the horror of wounds caused by industrial weaponry. However, as suggested in the quotation above, the exigencies of active service, including the often limited access to medical officers, demanded innovative and rapid nursing responses to the life-threatening injuries of an increasingly technological war.²

Using surgical nursing in war as a ‘case study’ for developments in nursing practices and professional autonomy, the chapter examines the changes to the domain of their work by nursing sisters on active service overseas. The first section explores extensions to the nursing role, most particularly in the care of wounds and burns. Both of
these areas of practice were part of the inventory of traditional nursing work, but the pressures of war demanded that all nurses should become adept at dealing with ever more complex treatments. Crucially for nursing sisters on active service, they were increasingly in charge of treatment regimes without medical supervision. The second section explores the expansion of nursing duties, those that had hitherto been the domain of medicine. These roles included the commencement and management of blood transfusions, surgical work and anaesthesia. The chapter’s third section considers ‘new work’, the most critical of which was the administration and use of penicillin, although it is acknowledged that the utility of this drug went far beyond the treatment of surgical patients. This ‘miracle drug’ was one of the most important clinical developments for both medicine and nursing. Furthermore, because neither profession had previous experience with it, they needed to learn together, creating new lines of inter-professional relationships.

During the Second World War it was expected that women would become active citizens to help the war effort, but within the accepted gender constructions of femininity, that is, maintaining a supportive and domestic sphere. However, the importance of developing more collaborative working relationships between doctors and nurses was appreciated from the early months of the war, when the War Office ordered that RAMC medical officers and QAs attend gas courses together. The placing of nurses and doctors in the same classroom as equals, even though it was not for clinical lectures, reveals the contradictory attitudes to men and women’s participation in war. The male authorities both wanted and did not want there to be equal gender relations. Female nurses may have been very much the subordinate gender and profession in civilian hospitals, but the proximity of living and working quarters in a war zone made the continuation of the hierarchy difficult. Learning non-clinical skills together could facilitate the team-work that would be needed to recover men for battle. For nurses as members of the military posted overseas, edicts about femininity were increasingly difficult to follow, and untenable in the face of the proliferation of complex injuries and the new technologies developed to treat them. As doctors on active service overseas established more collaborative relationships with nursing sisters outside the hospital wards and witnessed their work and apparent
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capabilities within those wards, they learnt to trust nurses to take on more complex work with less supervision and direction.

**Shifting work and gender boundaries**

As nurses extended and expanded their work beyond the ‘normal’ remit of nursing practice, the gender and professional boundaries between medicine and nursing blurred. On active service overseas nurses increasingly ‘stood in’ for their medical colleagues as the exigencies of war demanded. One sister, part of the BEF evacuating Marseilles in June 1940, wrote that the colonel of her unit asked her about the medical fitness or otherwise of the patients: ‘He said he could not find the M.O. to ask him. I gave my opinion.’ Sister Mary Morris’s diary states that she and her colleagues, ‘examined each man, carefully, referring any urgent cases to Col. Cordwell’. Others prescribed and administered pain relief without a medical officer. Sister Betty Parkin recalled passing a naso-gastric tube for a doctor when he was unable to do so. Sister Angela Bolton maintained that ‘The medical officers and sisters worked much more as a team than they did in hospitals back home. The unquestioning reverent obedience to doctors that had been instilled into us when we had been training had changed to an easy comradeship that made life pleasanter and more productive of ideas for the patients’ welfare.’

Others wrote of ‘rank [being] barely recognised’ and doctors helping the nurses on the ward as they created order out of the chaos of convoys. Yet nursing sisters did not experience this new confidence without some hostility; not all relations in the field were harmonious. Sister Helen Luker experienced difficulties with the medical staff on the HMS *Dorsetshire*, both clinically and professionally. On 7 November 1940 she complains that ‘Col Ward demands tea at 4.30pm to my intense annoyance’. Then, on 20 December 1940 she wrote:

> We are just cleaning up after the transfusion when Pte Hughes, a gunshot wound of arm in plaster [sic] has a secondary haemorrhage. I have great difficulty in calling Capt. Robertson and when he comes he’s not very helpful. We give packets of morphine and pray hard. I go to Capt. R twice more, but he doesn’t think fit to get up & help us, so I do what I think is best. But Garland + I are simply shaking with anxiety + there are lots of other ill patients as well.
Parkin’s irritation was reserved for a medical officer who would not even let the nurses organise the diets, something she felt was entirely the province of nurses and not doctors. Hutchison wrote of a particular doctor, who having ordered a nursing sister to give a drug intramuscularly that should have been administered intravenously (IV) let the sister take the blame for the blunder. When this medical officer then asked Hutchinson to give the drug IV, she refused, stating, ‘No, I do not have to. I am a Registered Nurse, and if I do not consider I am qualified to give a drug intravenously, I am entitled to refuse. I hereby refuse.’ Sister Joan Nicolson recalled the debacle following her refusal to work with a doctor who, she felt, had been overly harsh to a very young soldier who had deserted: ‘And so of course I was in grave trouble because it was considered insubordination and his rank was major and I was only a lieutenant.’ She was hauled in front of the colonel commanding her unit and informed him that ‘I believed we should be sanctuary for people brought in’. Although clearly guilty of insubordination, she was not disciplined. More importantly, both her behaviour and that of Hutchinson demonstrate a strength of will and professional confidence despite official medical superiority.

During the First World War men did not always appreciate being ordered by women, especially if those orders involved painful and arduous treatment regimes. Despite the 20-year gap, many men had not altered their attitudes significantly. Nurses were not necessarily allowed to enjoy professional autonomy in the same way that men did. Just as the Army needed to rely on the self-control of soldiers in far-flung war zones where the lines of authority were fewer, so nurses were enabled to be more autonomous in these theatres of war, but this autonomy was contingent on geography and the levels of medical officer cover. The closer to home and civilisation, the fewer the opportunities for new ways of practice, something that would have a lasting effect in the aftermath of war. Despite these impediments to the new working practices of nursing sisters, they managed to develop their role in new and professionally legitimating ways.

The adoption of ‘medical’ tasks by nurses was not new and there had always been a body of nurses who had little use for the constraints of professional boundaries. Where they saw a problem, they dealt with it. As medical technologies became commonplace – such as the thermometer in the early twentieth century, the sphygmomanometer
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The exigencies of war had a profound effect not only on those nurses who were posted overseas but also those nurses and probationers who were required to care for combatants on British soil after ill

Extending nursing work

Wound care

The exigencies of war had a profound effect not only on those nurses who were posted overseas but also those nurses and probationers who were required to care for combatants on British soil after ill
and injured soldiers were evacuated back to ‘Blighty’. Traditional hospital ‘dressing rounds’, as they were called, followed an ordered formula, with little room for individual decision making. In a hospital system where student nurses performed the majority of nursing work, such formulaic practice made perfect sense. Nurses needed to be able to care for patients with ‘unconscious competence’, in order to prevent accidental harm. There were aspects of the dressing-round ritual that included some level of decision making, such as not beginning dressings until after the dust had settled following the daily cleaning regime. Changeable criteria that required skills in negotiating indeterminacy, such as beginning with the cleanest wounds and leaving the most dirty or infected wounds till the end, thereby altering the organisation of the round, were not necessarily part of the process. The onslaught of injured men from battle denied the hospital-ward dressing round its ritual. Nurses needed to develop more reactive nursing skills rapidly. Morris’s experiences as a student following the evacuation of soldiers from Dunkirk were to provide excellent training for her overseas postings:

As I entered the Casualty department, I was astounded to see so many wet, dirty and injured people there. Some were soldiers (I guessed they must be Dunkirk survivors), others were civilians … they were all laid out on stretchers on the floor, and most of our surgeons and physicians were there, assisted by several senior Sisters and Staff Nurses. I was given the job of removing dirty wet clothing, so that they could be examined by the doctors. Several men had their skin flayed by oil burns, a very painful condition, others were injured by bomb splinters, and some injured by machine gun fire from the air as they came across the Channel.

Sister Penny Salter’s recollections of the arrival of convoys from Dunkirk, when she was a student, invoke the same level of suffering. Like Morris, the work caring for the survivors would prepare her partly for the challenges that she would face when posted overseas:

At 2.30 am we ran across the grounds and down the long cold and dreary corridors of Park Prewett Hospital meeting on the way the male orderlies, strangers to us, of whom we learned at a later date were volunteer pacifists who had been up all night helping with the evacuation of the hospital … on that May morning in 1940, the ambulances began to arrive, carrying the maimed, the lame and the blind. Many were on stretchers, others limping along supported by weary comrades clinging to them.
Everything here was well organized, the teamwork between doctors and nursing staff was outstanding, not a moment was lost in dealing with the terrible injuries we had to face: foul, putrid festering wounds that stank to high heaven, sustained by men of remarkable courage.

Our first task was to get them bathed and cleaned up before putting them to bed in to cool crisp sheets, but this was not easy as their feet was [sic] the problem. Their feet were in such a terrible state that even after soaking we had to cut their boots off.

The stench of dried blood and gangrenous flesh was nauseating. I remember so well asking an orderly to stay with one of my patients for a short while as, so like many of my colleagues I went outside and was violently sick … the stench remained in my nostrils for days.33

These experiences as students may have prepared them for the smell and decay of war injuries, but the challenges of work on overseas postings stretched the Army nurses’ expertise ‘to capacity’.34 On active service the limited access to medical staff, the severity of the injuries that required dressings, the sheer numbers of combatants arriving needing nursing care, the complexities of the wounds and the prolonged period between the wound being sustained and the access to a qualified nurse conspired to create the ‘perfect storm’ of work.35 In a 1940 publication designed to prepare the nurse for war service, the work of the surgical nurse is described as, ‘a strange experience … at the beginning they will often be shocked by the physical enormities that are inevitable in war as it is waged to-day’.36

Many of the complex wounds that nurses were required to dress on active service overseas would have been seen to by medical staff, or at least under supervision of a doctor in civilian practice. Bruce Dick, a consulting thoracic surgeon, wrote that war nurses would need ‘resourcefulness in certain emergencies’ that perhaps had hitherto not been necessary.37 In his letter to The Lancet, John Elam maintained that nurses and other first-aid workers should all be trained in gas and air analgesia ‘for the dressing of war wounds’.38 Morris was clearly proud of the ‘resourcefulness’ of their surgical team in Normandy: ‘Another new M.O. arrived here today. He is very pleasant but rather astonished by our unconventional methods of surgery and post operative [sic] nursing. We have all learned a great deal here, mainly by trial and error. Necessity has created a great deal of inventiveness.’39
In the wars of the twentieth century, hospitals could provide valuable respite for battle-exhausted soldiers, but the injuries sustained also created the need to perform what could seem like barbaric surgical interventions. Nursing sisters knew that it was their ‘meticulous care in regard to asepsis at all times, in spite of hectic rushes [which] may mean the difference of a man keeping or losing a limb’. However, sometimes men arrived having had the amputation in the field, using brutal methods developed to prevent gangrene. In June 1940, the Nursing Times informed its readers that in order to prevent gangrene spreading through the stump flap following amputation, ‘a new and drastic form of amputation – known as a guillotine amputation – was introduced’. In the desert war from late 1941, nurses were witnessing and writing about the damage that this method caused. One TANS sister wrote to Dame Katharine Jones expressing her distress over the ‘Many limbs [that] had to be re-amputated as the first operation had been performed up in the front line C.C.S. by Greek M.O.s. The limb had been cut off, arteries tied and a dressing applied leaving a great raw wound that could never heal. It was very difficult to make the patients understand why they must have a second operation.’ It is unlikely that even as Matron-in-Chief, Jones was able to affect the decision to stop using the guillotine method, but, critically, nurses were gaining in confidence to question surgical practice. Furthermore, they needed to use all their skills to support their soldier-patients for future surgery.

The extension of nurses’ work with war injuries thus gave rise to new demands for psychological care. It was of vital importance for nurses ‘to gain the patient’s confidence and co-operation’ in order to provide life-saving and -affirming treatments. Morris wrote in her diary of her concern for one lieutenant who had sustained an abdominal wound during the fighting at Arnhem in the autumn of 1944: ‘Brian will be alright physically once the wound has healed but I think it will be a long time before he gets over the shock of Arnhem. Connie tells me that he has to be constantly sedated at night to stop him screaming in terror. He is only twenty-two years old.’ Sister Catherine Hutchinson’s greatest sympathies lay with her patients who had colostomies. Medical authorities knew that in order for abdominal injuries to have any hope of healing, immediate surgery was needed, but this led to men being operated upon and then
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having days before any further treatment. Many of Hutchinson’s patients had sustained gunshot wounds to the abdomen and then had travelled by train through Italy to Naples before being admitted to her ward on HMS Empire Clyde:

During these days – for days it was – rather than hours – some of them had not had their dressings (they had not got to the stage of bags yet) properly changed – just more padding added as the bandages became stained with faecal fluid. They bulged horrifically as if bearing a pillow over their abdomen. If the ship was in the Naples harbour they came direct to us exhausted, apprehensive and stinking … I took note of such patients, knowing that I would have to struggle to undo the work of neglect … When all the dressings were off, a sorry state was revealed. Because most of them were recent casualties, the outpourings were mostly fluid or semi solid; the acidity in the fluid had excoriated the skin around the opening in a wide area, leaving most of the abdomen red and sore, with broken skin around the actual opening.

Hutchinson’s acknowledgement of the scale of her responsibility for the wounded men is tempered by her understandable dismay at their surgery and the realisation that she will need to do more than just care for the men’s physical needs. Evidence of sporadic and occasionally successful performance of colostomies can be found from the eighteenth century. According to Dorothy Doughty, in one of the only historical essays on stoma surgery, by the twentieth century colostomies had become a realistic treatment option, although the products to support colostomy care were still in their infancy.

The horror of the colostomy was not lost on the nurses or medical staff. The narrative of the disgust that a stoma creates in people was exemplified in the 1956 propaganda film The Feminine Touch. In the film, designed to improve recruitment and retention in the post-war nursing profession, the character of the matron uses the tragedy of the colostomy to dispel any question as to the vital importance of the nurse’s work in psychological as well as physical rehabilitation of the patient with a stoma. It is the nurse, the matron argues, and her response to the stoma that makes the difference to whether the patient can also accept the surgery. Even though Hutchinson maintained that she never had more than two colostomy patients at once, the stench from dressings that had not been changed since the original operation in the claustrophobic atmosphere of a hospital ship would
have increased the revulsion for all concerned. As the nursing sister in charge of the ward, Hutchinson’s commitment to extending her nursing skills was paramount to recovering the men.

The new technologies of the Second World War created advanced weaponry that could maim and harm with extensive and devastating consequences. The medical services were challenged to respond rapidly and with the requisite skills to save life. Some of the worst examples of these assaults on the human body involved burning. Many nursing sisters had some experience of caring for burns and some had received special post-registration training. Brenda McBryde attended the burns course at Bangor that had been instituted in the wake of the terrible injuries that had been sustained by airmen in 1940 during the Battle of Britain. Not all of the nursing sisters were so fortunate to receive specialist training prior to their overseas posting. All were shocked at the havoc that burns wreaked on their victims, whether from aircraft that went up in flames, burning oil as ships sank or being trapped in tanks. The developments in burns treatments meant that nurses were confronted with new and constantly evolving therapeutic regimes to salvage their soldier-patients.

**Burns**

E.C. Davidson ‘revolutionised’ burns treatment in 1925 when he introduced tannic acid. By the beginning of the Second World War the use of tannic acid for burns had been standardised and it was believed that their treatment therefore would cause ‘little difficulty’. In July 1940, in an article examining the treatment of incendiary bomb burns, the advice from Dr R.G. Henderson was that tannic acid of a strength varying from 5 per cent to 20 per cent should be either sprayed or dabbed with gauze onto the burn. If this was then followed by an application of 10 per cent silver nitrate solution, a protective crust would be formed. By November of that year the *Nursing Mirror* was alerting its readers to the cessation of using tannic acid routinely for burns. Nurses were alerted to the dangers of tannic acid in the treatment of third degree burns and those on the hands and face, because of the extensive scarring and contractions that it could cause. Most nursing staff would not necessarily have been aware of the research into the treatment of burns with tannic acid,
but, even as a junior probationer, Morris would bear witness to the damage that it created when used on the hands and face:

Private Brian M. is one of the most severely burned. He is about eighteen years old – my age. His face and hands have been sprayed with tannic acid, which has set into a hard black cement. His arms are propped up in front of him on a pillow, the fingers extended like claws and his naked body hangs loosely on straps just clear of the bed.

Yet as nurses observed the catastrophe of burns, they were not always passive onlookers. Because all the methods of treating burns were dependent upon the nursing care, their observations would enable them to support developments in burns care as the war continued. One anonymous sister in the Middle East noted that ‘dyes, e.g. Triple dye treatment of burns was not a success in the topics’. Another nursing sister was posted to Gibraltar between 1940 and 1942: ‘I had ample opportunity of [sic] observing and comparing the merits of modern treatment for burns: tannic acid, triple dye, Vaseline and sulphonamide powder, saline baths and dressings, and I was much impressed by the excellent results obtained by enclosing limbs for several weeks in Plaster of Paris.’ Sister V. Shennan’s extensive notes sent to Dame Katharine Jones in 1943 from the Middle East on the care of the burns patient and the complex arrangements for treatment regimens suggest the close involvement of nurses in decisions regarding the needs of the patient. For example, she identified the actions to be taken in the case of a reaction to blood transfusions, the protocols for dressings and contra-indications to sulphonamide ‘emulsions’.

By 1941 the treatment for burns had developed significantly, following knowledge gained in the first two years of the war. Wing Commander Stanford Cade of the RAF acknowledged the worth of tannic acid and its life-saving value in civilian life, but argued that the nature of ‘Airman’s burns’ was such that its benefits were reduced. Tulle gras dusted with sulphanilamide and kept moist with saline drips was now the treatment of choice for many burns. Where the burns affected limbs, jaconet or silk bags were recommended to retain the moisture and promote healing. These new treatments were also less painful than tannic acid. The alternative was the envelope or Bunyan method, named after John Bunyan, the surgeon who
invented it. In 1942, Archibald McIndoe was advocating tannic acid and silver nitrate for non-functioning parts of the body, such as the back or abdomen.66 However, for burns to the hands and face or in the case of third degree burns he argued for the use of sulphanilamide tulle gras moistened with saline, if possible in conjunction with saline baths.67 Despite these new treatment options, the debates as to the relative harms and benefits of tannic acid and other regimens continued throughout the war. In her diary entry for 9 November 1944, Bolton wrote of a patient who was ‘the worst case of burns I have seen out here, three-quarters of the skin surface being involved ... we badly need a breakthrough for burns’.68 Despite the developments in burns care, even in the latter months of the war, the choices were limited and success rates not certain.

Like Morris and Salter, Sister Ann Radloff gained useful experience in caring for injured soldiers as a student nurse in Britain, including those who had been burnt. In her memoir, she recalled the archaic nature of tannic acid and other topical treatments and demonstrated a prescient understanding of the regimes for shock:

The troopship Lancastria was bombed and sunk off Cherbourg. Very few of the survivors could walk – how can you when you have been covered in flaming oil? Those were the days of Tannic Acid (sometimes even cold tea leaves were used) for treatment of burns. And the Bunyan bag was an enormous cellophane container filled with saline into which charred limbs were inserted to be entirely surrounded by fluid. Corporal C. – ‘Jock’ – was an unrecognizable human hulk with a human soul. He had been enveloped in burning oil and as a living torch had jumped into the sea. Perhaps the salt water saved him but the oil was thick and cohesive and had burnt right through to the tissues. Jock had to be moved and turned – worst of all he sometimes had to be lifted onto a bedpan. The skin contracted and Jock was never free from pain unless mercifully drugged with morphine ... All severe burns cases suffered from dehydration which can be remedied by a saline drip, if, as in Jock’s case the lips are too corroded and swollen and the tongue too painful for fluid to be given by mouth. But they could not find a vein in Jock’s charred body. So Corporal C. died …69

Others were luckier and the sea did in fact save them. Betty Evans, working as a student nurse in London during the Dunkirk evacuation, noted ‘a terrific number of pilots baling with dreadful burns, baling out into the sea … but the pilots were baling out into the flames and so had dreadful burns, but the ones who were in the water, because
of the saline, their skin grafts did better’.70 Sisters Geraldine Edge and Mary Johnstone were posted to the Hospital Carrier *Leinster*, from where they evacuated patients between Naples and Anzio. On one such trip they embarked 30 American sailors, all of whom had been burnt when their ship was torpedoed: ‘hours of immersion in cold water seems a harsh method of dealing with such cases, but the effect of salt water on burns is found to be extraordinarily good and strangely enough the ensuing shock is less’. Although at least one did die, many survived.71

Too often, as Lt-Colonel Norman Logie (RAMC) wrote in The *Lancet* of his experience in caring for burns victims in the desert, there were no nurses. Although, as he maintained, the orderlies did what they could to support the healing of burns patients, ‘they were not nurses and they were few in number’. They needed simple regimes that were not affected by the frequent dust storms and the need for lengthy evacuation journeys. He therefore recommended tannic acid and silver nitrate for burns, but not of the hands and face, which should be treated with tulle gras soaked in sulphanilamide.72 However, he cautioned over the possible toxicity from contact of sulphanilamide with raw areas that could raise the blood concentration to a ‘dangerous level’.73 By 1944 penicillin was available for burns, thus theoretically rendering such concerns obsolete. Evans, who landed with the Second Front into France in 1944, recalled using penicillin in conjunction with tulle gras on the burns of men who had been trapped in tanks, but there were fears that penicillin would not be beneficial in all burns cases.74

Although tannic acid in conjunction with silver nitrate was an uncertain cure, according to Brigadier Philip Mitchiner, honorary surgeon to the king, it was useful as a first-aid measure in many burns, except those on the face and hands, and was particularly useful in preventing shock.75 McIndoe wrote in the *Nursing Mirror* that ‘the first and most important thing is the control of shock. This takes precedence over any form of local treatment, apart from the protection of the burn and the dusting on of sulphanilamide powder.’ PMRAFNS Sister H.B. Woods also claimed precedence for the treatment of shock as the primary concern, followed by the prevention of infection.76 Woods’ dictum that these were the primary responsibilities for nurses in burns cases is critical, given their position in the
overseas military medical service. She recommended the treatment of shock by warming the patient with electric blankets and hot-water bottles and then the administration of warm fluids orally, per rectum or intravenously\textsuperscript{77} – work which would have been understood as nursing. Evans maintained that even in the summer of 1944 they had the ‘medical staff putting up the drips’,\textsuperscript{78} yet many nurses had taken on IV therapy as part of their nursing role. The administration of IV plasma had become a nursing duty before the war, but the frequency of infusions and the lack of medical staff to monitor them on active service overseas meant that its place in the lexicon of nursing work increased. As the war raged around the nurses at the Anzio beachhead, one nurse wrote that: ‘In the Post-Operative Ward it was unusual to find a patient who was not having either blood or plasma, and the care of the “drips” was one person’s constant work.’\textsuperscript{79} In an article to the \textit{Nursing Mirror} on 2 September 1939, the day before war was declared, nurses were informed that their duty was: ‘The care of the recipient, which will include the preparation of the site to be used … sterilising and the preparation of the necessary apparatus … the doctor … controls the flow when the apparatus cannot be adjusted and safely left without attendance.’\textsuperscript{80} As the long years of the war progressed and realisation grew of the changing requirements that were being placed on the medical services, the roles of the nursing staff needed to expand to this challenge.

\textbf{Expanded nursing work}

\textit{Transforming transfusions}

Our Medical Office \textsuperscript{sic} being so busy receiving patients could not always be present at admissions. This was to our advantage as we became well acquainted with the stethoscope and commenced to do our own investigations for diagnosis, to be checked later by the Medical Officer. Besides becoming quite adept at diagnosing we learned to do many treatments which we would not be allowed to do at home. What a great thrill I had at setting up my first blood transfusion.\textsuperscript{81}

Whether in Britain or on active service overseas, when medical officers could not be spared to monitor blood transfusions, such work was passed to the nursing staff. Thus, by 1943, June Hamilton stated, even student nurses in Britain were monitoring the blood flow of a
transfusion and it was accepted that the staff nurse would take action if the flow stopped. Only if the staff nurse could not start the flow again would the registrar be informed.\textsuperscript{82} According to Margarete Sandelowski, the delegation of work because of the inconvenience of mundane activities to the medical profession maintained a strict hierarchy between professions and, by implication, gender.\textsuperscript{83} Nurses’ duties expanded into key positions in the resuscitation wards on active service overseas, work that was critical in restoring men with shock before surgery. The right of the medical staff to dictate that work had not altered. McBryde recalled the order: ‘Quarter of morphia, Sister. Straight away. Two pints of blood, one of plasma.’\textsuperscript{84} At times, nurses were simply unable to find a medical officer when the convoys arrived, and their willingness to start transfusions without medical supervision was paramount if men were to survive.\textsuperscript{85} As Sister P.M. Dyer’s quote above demonstrates, British nurses were excited rather than alarmed when war brought with it a range of new tasks, and did not necessarily view the delegation of the work as a sign of their subservience.

The limited access that British women had to the medical profession in the early years of the twentieth century meant that few considered it as a real option. This left nursing as the natural choice for those who wished to care for the sick and support the health of the community.\textsuperscript{86} At least two of the nurses’ testimonies used in this book identify that they had brothers who were either doctors or officers in the war, suggesting a gender rather than class split.\textsuperscript{87} Whilst nurses were deferential to doctors, there is little evidence to suggest that they considered either themselves or the work that they did as subordinate to medicine. Even deference reduced as nurses gained the professional and personal confidence that came with active service.\textsuperscript{88} Nor is there evidence that they saw the delegation of tasks previously considered ‘medical’ as an indication of their subordination. Rather, they greeted with enthusiasm the implication that they were now seen as worthy and capable colleagues; this perhaps especially when sometimes the nurses transfused patients and sometimes the medical staff did.\textsuperscript{89} If work was interchangeable, it could not be subordinate.

During the First World War research into shock and haemorrhage led to developments in blood transfusions, but these involved highly complex and time-consuming techniques.\textsuperscript{90} By 1918, although
methods for storing whole blood had been developed, these were too late to be of benefit to most soldiers.\textsuperscript{91} The understanding of blood grouping was embryonic and, according to Carden-Coyne, there were only a few units that had the expertise to carry out the process.\textsuperscript{92} Furthermore, the instructions that most medical officers had been given in respect of the provision of blood transfusions were inadequate.\textsuperscript{93} Given the potential dangers of the transfusion procedure, it required the active participation and supervision of medical staff, with the support of nursing sisters and orderlies. By the time of the Spanish Civil War, ‘great strides’ had been made in the storage and preservation of blood for transfusion, enabling nurses and doctors to treat shock quickly and with good effect. However, the technologies, still in their infancy, meant that medical and nursing staff continued to provide direct transfusions, sometimes acting as donors themselves. This created the additional hazard that often too much blood was taken from these essential workers, who then needed periods of rest and recuperation themselves.\textsuperscript{94}

Cynthia Toman argues that as blood transfusion work was delegated to nurses in the Second World War, it lost its place as a prestigious medical technology and became simply another job for the nursing staff.\textsuperscript{95} The delegation of medical tasks to nurses as the work becomes commonplace and mundane exemplifies Margaret and Patrice Higonnet’s ‘double helix’ in which women are always subordinated and ‘other’. When work is handed to women, not only is it because men no longer want it, but it is concurrently devalued because it now belongs to women.\textsuperscript{96} However, this is perhaps too simplistic or rigid a way to understand the expansion of nursing work and the delegation of what was once medical work to nurses.\textsuperscript{97}

The great changes in transfusion technology between the First and Second World Wars meant that far more people could benefit from blood transfusion therapy and the therapy itself was no longer experimental. Sister D.M. Long wrote of the life-saving benefits of rapid transfusion that could now be given with ‘no fuss’.\textsuperscript{98} Once blood transfusions became something from which people expected to benefit and did not carry the risks of experimental medicine, in order to prevent it being a dehumanising technology the apparatus needed a human buffer.\textsuperscript{99} Thus the Second World War nurse not only made the technology possible but was the human face that enabled
the patient to accept it. That is not to argue that the work had not become mundane to the medical officers who wanted to pass it on, but that there were also positive reasons for nurses to take on such work. The reassignment of blood transfusion care was arguably a natural progression as it moved from an experimental procedure that demanded medical expertise in the First World War, to a procedure that demanded the close monitoring of both technology and patient, both of which came and continue to be part of nursing, rather than medicine. It was not only that the medical profession delegated what had become simple work to nurses, but that blood transfusion had now become nursing work because its nature had changed.

The organisation of the British Blood Transfusion Service in 1938, shortly after the Munich Treaty, was to give the British Army a significant advantage over all other nations. It meant that safe, whole blood could be accessed quickly. The Americans had discovered in 1939 that unfiltered blood plasma was a useful substitute for whole blood, and continued to use it, often in place of whole blood. However, it was not as effective as whole blood in treating shock. On 5 October 1939, the Transfusion and Surgical Research Laboratory left for France. This laboratory was disbanded after the evacuation from Dunkirk in the summer of 1940, after which the British Transfusion Unit was established. In 1941, whilst undertaking her training, Emily Soper was allocated to join her hospital’s transfusion unit:

We had a sister and staff nurse came from what was called the Civil Defence Unit and surprise, surprise, I was made their junior. So when the siren went off, we had to report to our, er, little quarters that were allotted to us, so we had to be ready, but fortunately again, we were not required to use our blood transfusion expertise on any casualties, but we were delegated to help our doctors, if they needed any help in the hospital.

Importantly, with such a system in place in civilian practice, the military medical authorities were able to transfer knowledge rapidly into the field. By the spring of 1940, it was acknowledged that all medical officers, nurses and orderlies would have to understand the essentials of storing, preserving and administering blood transfusions for shock. It was no longer work for a few specialist units; the technology and clinical practice requirements meant that blood transfusions were transformed from a complex, medical task to
C.A. Wells, an honorary surgeon at the Royal Liverpool Hospital, wrote in the *Nursing Times* in July 1945 that ‘first bottle of blood I ever saw in a refrigerator was in the Meath Hospital in Dublin in 1939, I do not care to think how many I have seen since then!’ In April 1942, a *Nursing Times* editorial reflected on wartime advances in medicine and surgery, commenting on the great change in the provision in blood transfusion: ‘whereas before the war it would be two hours on average from the time the telephone rang in his [the doctor’s] house to the time the needle was in the vein, to-day he could be starting the infusion within 20 minutes from the first tinkle of the bell’.

In October 1944, Morris was working in a hospital set up in a convent near Louvain. Despite this not being particularly close to the front line, there was clearly a more collaborative way of working in which inter-professional expectations of practice were blurred. Thus, the nurses engaged in expanded areas of practice and the medical staff would help with the more nursing-type patient care of settling men into bed. They took convoy after convoy, some from CCSs near Nijmegen and others from a hospital near Arnhem:

Some were given plasma at once, others blood transfusions as soon as we could identify the group (We have a small blood bank here) … Have just crawled off duty at 2 a.m. The patients are cleaned up, undressed (we had to cut off their clothing) and in bed. There are six blood transfusions and 13 blood plasmas ‘on the go’. Hope Connie can manage for the rest of the night. She has two good orderlies.

As the military medical services responded to the needs of a mobile war in which men could be treated much closer to the front, hospitals and CCSs were increasingly supported by independent blood transfusion units. One nursing sister noted that ‘Blood transfusion and resuscitation service are splendidly organised especially in the forward areas’. This was particularly vital, since ‘Gun shot wounds of abdomen are received into warm beds, a blood transfusion given at once and treatment for shock carried out.’ Sister E.L. L’Estrange also noted the importance of the blood transfusion unit running independently from theatre. Given that all the casualties were exhausted and needed blood, this separate service could provide blood as necessary without removing the surgeon, theatre sister or
orderlies from the operating table. This was not the case in all situations. The hospital ship the *Llandovery Castle* collected its blood from Alexandria for each journey. The blood then became the responsibility of the surgeon, the trained orderly and the theatre sister.\(^\text{111}\)

In whatever manner a particular blood transfusion system was organised on active service overseas, accountability was invariably cross-professional. The medical military authorities appreciated that 'blood work' was now an essential part of war medical services and needed support and collegiality to ensure that blood was stored and administered safely and efficiently. Unlike some other practices, blood work remained part of the lexicon of nursing duties post-war.\(^\text{112}\) Alongside nurses' participation in ever more complex wound care, it was clearly not a cause of inter-professional angst. However,
there were other roles that were handed to nurses only ‘for the
duration’ and only because of the extreme challenges of the war.
Possibly the most controversial expanded role was that of nurses in
anaesthetics.¹¹³

The nurse-anaesthetist

Between 1940 and 1942 a series of letters, many verging on the
vitriolic, appeared in the *British Medical Journal* in relation to nurse-
anaesthetists. All were written by medical staff, none of whom appear
to have been on active service overseas. On 28 September 1940, F.B.
Parsons forwarded to the *British Medical Journal* a letter from medical
staff of Addenbrooke’s Hospital in Cambridge to the Association of
Anaesthetists. In the letter they argued that ‘with the outbreak of war
five out of the eight honorary anaesthetists to the hospital were mobi-
ilised and left the district’.¹¹⁴ Since that time, the hospital had relied
on the remaining three and increasingly junior and inexperienced
medical officers to undertake anaesthetic duties, whilst the numbers
of patients within the hospital rose. This, they felt, was unsustainable.
The answer was to train nurses ‘who had held the post of sister in a
ward or operating theatre’ to give anaesthetics.¹¹⁵ They would not
supplant honorary anaesthetists, but would support the work of their
colleagues in the operating theatres and, therefore, their patients.

The decision caused uproar. Nurses had been employed to act
as anaesthetists by the British military on active service overseas in
the First World War, but the practice had ceased in the aftermath of
that earlier conflict.¹¹⁶ The Americans had continued to use nurse-
anaesthetists in the inter-war period and, according to Parsons, there
were a number of British medical officers who, having worked with
these nurses, were impressed by the service that they were able to
provide.¹¹⁷ This did not assuage the anger of several correspondents
to the *British Medical Journal*. A.M. Barford’s letter, published on
5 October 1940, stated that ‘the employment for this can be no other
than a retrograde step … I hope I shall never be a patient there, and
I venture to say that each one of them [medical staff] would not wish
a nurse to give him an anaesthetic.’¹¹⁸ W. Stanley-Sykes wrote of
nurse-anaesthetists as being the ‘bane of the second-rate American
medical school’ and praised the Canadians for outlawing the practi-
tice.¹¹⁹ Despite such antagonism to the idea of nurse-anaesthetists,
there was a caveat to the correspondence from one medical man, that although nurses should not replace medically trained anaesthetists, they could perhaps give anaesthetics for ‘minor surgical work’. What constituted ‘minor’ or major surgery on active service overseas was meaningless. Army nurses shifted the boundaries of their surgical practice as the exigencies of war demanded, and neither they nor their medical colleagues showed any of the professional anxieties of their counterparts on home soil.

After being shipwrecked on the SS Kuala, following the escape from Singapore in February 1942, Sister Edith Stevenson and her fellow passengers, found themselves island-hopping to avoid detection by the Japanese:

We knew those who had infected wounds would die and there was one case of gangrene needing amputation … One other nurse and myself had been trained in operating theatre work, we knew the procedures but we had neither the instruments or anaesthetic.

One morning as if in answer to a prayer, a doctor Kirkwood arrived. What a relief to see him and his two orderlies. They had left Singapore after the Japanese invasion, travelling in a small motor-boat, they flew the Red Cross Flag and the Japanese allowed them safe passage. The doctor decided to amputate the leg as soon as we could make preparations. He had ether and chloroform and a few instruments. Strangely enough, he had no scissors, I was glad I had mine. We had no steriliser, so I found an empty kerosene tin and boiled the instruments in this over a charcoal brasier [sic], it was all very unorthodox. Doctor had some dressings and when all was ready we began. We were in the open air. Doctor started the anaesthetic and then handed over to his orderly whilst he began the operation. We amputated the leg and were just about ready to stitch up the flap of skin round the stump when the orderly flopped to the ground in a faint. The smell of the anaesthetic, together with an empty stomach proved too much for him. I took over the anaesthetic and doctor finished the stitching. The second orderly attended to his colleague.

Following the capture of the ship the Rangitane, a group of nursing sisters were amongst the only British military women during the whole war to be held in captivity by Germans. The German sailors appear to have been profoundly uncomfortable holding them as prisoners. Whilst the men were taken below deck, the nurses were placed in a ‘wooden structure on deck’. The German sailors had been preparing to lock the door, but an appeal by the nurses not to do so
was accepted and ‘we were left with guards after a drink of good hot coffee with sugar and milk’. The nurses, aware of the levels of illness and injury on board, sent to the German ship’s doctor to ask if they could help:

Very quickly we were in his surgery … The doctor gave the anaesthetics and then left Sister to keep the patient under, carefully explaining that nurses did not do that work in Germany. ‘Nor in England’ we answered him. When we got there he was just finishing inspecting the wounds, and, with our help was able to begin operating on the serious cases at once.

Evelyn Cottrell, a nursing sister with the Spears Unit, was part of the contingent of nurses at the battle of Monte Cassino:

That was a very gruesome time, we had so many casualties, errm, so many casualties brought to us that they were all laid out the length of this room in rows and the colonel and the other doctors went round and the ones they thought they could save, they worked on, and the ones they, they couldn’t do anything for, they hadn’t time to do anything for and we used to dig out bits of shrapnel and err errm give blood all the time, we were always giving blood transfusions and err salines and things like that and we did a lot of minor surgery really with err, well with shrapnel bits and things and we didn’t sleep, we just worked day and night and the colonel operated and operated day and night and had sort of an hour’s sleep and off again and they were working like mad and a lot of people died, but a lot of people he saved, that wouldn’t have been saved if they’d had to go back any further.

These three separate and quite different accounts are critical for demonstrating the very different attitudes of doctors and nurses on active service to their perhaps more conservative colleagues in Britain. First, the admission by Stevenson that, had she had instruments and a means of anaesthesia, she and her nurse colleague would have operated on the severely injured man themselves suggests a willingness to ignore professionally held beliefs about what constituted nursing or medical work. Second, none of the incidents created any anxieties between either the medical practitioners or the nursing staff; all seemingly worked to the conviction that professional boundaries should not be maintained for the sake of the injured patients. Third, it was the male orderly who fainted, not the female nurse. Although the multiple gender contradictions that arose in the Second World War remained a source of concern for those keen to preserve the status quo, episodes like these identify the
vital importance that such inter-professional concerns were ignored and, perhaps more pertinently, that they were no longer deemed appropriate. On active service overseas, British nursing sisters and their medical colleagues clearly believed it was the nurses’ duty to expand their roles, despite professional and gendered notions, and that the most important person in the equation was the patient, not the nurse and not the doctor.

Thus far in this chapter the focus has been on duties that extended the province of nurses’ work, such as their increasing responsibility for complex wounds, and on work that was an expansion of the nursing role into what had been previously considered medical work, for example, blood transfusions and the participation of nursing staff in anaesthetics. There was, however, one area of practice that would necessitate collaborative working, that required both professions to learn together almost from the beginning, and that did not enter the lexicon of medical work until 1942 – penicillin.

**New work: ‘The new wonder drug Penicillin’**

Penicillin was made available to military patients in 1943 and was arguably the ‘most significant achievement of the Second World War science and technology’. It was also a critical intervention for nurses, despite some initial fears. Prior to its development, often the only way to save a patient’s life was through careful, meticulous and time-consuming nursing. Once penicillin became available it was as if nursing had ‘gone out of the window’. Since their discovery and production in 1935, the sulphonamide drugs that were the precursors to penicillin had proved highly useful chemotherapeutic agents for the inhibition of certain bacteria. Sulphanilamide was effective against streptococcal infections, sulphapyridine against pneumococcal infections, gonorrhoea and meningitis, and sulphaguanidine successfully treated some cases of dysentery.

However, a number of problems with the sulphonamides meant that they were not the ideal drug therapies. For many patients they led to nausea and vomiting, and for others, depression, dizziness and headaches were also common. By 1943 a paper appeared in the medical press alerting doctors to the possibility of allergic reactions to the sulpha drugs. More serious, but not as common, were
the side-effects of agranulocytosis and haemolytic anaemia. In the former, reduced white cell counts were noted that led to ulceration of the mouth and throat and a general deterioration in the patient’s condition. The latter manifested as jaundice and haemoglobinuria. According to C.M. Fletcher of the Radcliffe Infirmary at Oxford, whilst the sulpha drugs had ‘revolutionized many parts of medicine’, their potentially ‘severely poisonous effects’ meant that ‘no one could claim that they were ideal’. Importantly, penicillin could cure staphylococcus infections which the sulpha drugs could not. Furthermore, its safety was believed in absolutely, and any early problems were blamed on the production process rather than on the drug itself. It was not until 1945 that a paper appeared in the British Medical Journal informing readers of the possibility of allergic reactions, warning that ‘it is understood that the above is the only occurrence of a reaction of this type [eczema and discharge] to penicillin therapy in more than 30,000 cases treated in the B.L.A. [British Liberation Army]’. Despite such ardent confidence in the marvel of penicillin, in its very early days there were some substantial problems. Florey and his team struggled to produce it in sufficient quantities. Moreover, penicillin was so rapidly excreted by the kidneys that in the very early experimental uses on patients in England, staff had to collect the patient’s urine and extract the penicillin to provide further doses. From these very early experiments, it was realised that the co-operation and interest of the nursing staff was essential.

Although penicillin was available from 1943, as one report in the British Journal of Nursing maintained, ‘its manufacture even in minute quantities is so tedious and lengthy that the entire output is reserved for the Services’. One effect of this, which caused consternation in the press and amongst practitioners in the field, was that its use for the military meant that it was available for German POWs but not British civilians, even those whose injuries were war related. According to a brief report in the British Medical Journal, ‘the Government was required by the Geneva Convention to care for wounded prisoners of war, without distinction of nationality, equally with our own personnel’, and there was just not enough available to treat both the military and civilians. Despite this pronouncement, there were occasional experiments with penicillin on members of the
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civilian population, although it was used only as a "corpse-raising drug," i.e., not being tried until all else has failed'.

In December 1943, *The Lancet* reported that Florey and his team had been in North Africa since the summer, testing the efficacy of penicillin. They demonstrated that it was effective on all soft-tissue wounds, including septic wounds, and that a combatant infected with gonorrhoea could be treated and returned to the front within three days. By 1944, it was more generally used in war zones, but not without its difficulties for both the nursing staff and the patients themselves. According to much of the analysis in the nursing and medical press, it could not be given orally and its rapid excretion meant that it needed to be given as intramuscular injections at three-hourly intervals. The injections were very painful, repetitive and interrupted the combatant patient’s much-needed sleep. Alternatively it could be given as a constant intravenous infusion, but this required very careful nursing attention and a medical presence to site the infusion cannula, both of which could be difficult on active service overseas. In February 1945, Sister M.K.I. Harpin wrote to Dame Katharine Jones maintaining that a method of administering penicillin orally to a patient with pneumonia had been used and had worked, although it still required a three-hourly intervention and could not have been pleasant for the patient:

A level teaspoonful of alkali – which in this case was magnesium trisilicate or sodium bicarbonate, was taken dissolved in a quarter of a pint of milk. Ten minutes later the Penicillin beaten up with an egg, and with a little milk and glucose added was given. This procedure was repeated three hourly, each dose being followed by a mouth wash.

For those nurses and doctors seeing penicillin in use in the early days, it was like a miracle. Morris described it as 'The new wonder drug Penicillin', which, she wrote, was 'a great help in the fight to save the lives of young men like Len. This is the first time I have seen the antibiotic in action … It seems particularly good in preventing gangrene infections in gunshot wounds.' However, in October 1944 Morris had another patient whose infected stump did not appear to respond to penicillin. Unfortunately she does not follow up this case in her diary, so it is not known whether the treatment was eventually successful or not. Bolton’s war memoir records the first
time she saw penicillin used, sometime in the spring of 1944, whilst nursing in India:

Major Niblock and Joan Inman were there, dressed as for an operation in gauze masks, sterile gowns and rubber gloves. The major was drawing some yellow liquid into a large syringe. He held it up to the light, saying, ‘This is the new drug, which has just arrived. It is called Penicillin and we are going to try it on this patient.’ After carefully cleaning the skin, he injected the drug into a muscle … Just before going off duty we visited the ward once more and were astonished at the improved state of the wound. There was no longer any doubt – the infection was receding. After five days of three-hourly injections the solider was able to walk with the help of a stick, finally making a complete recovery.149

Bolton does not say who administered the three-hourly injections to this man, but it is unlikely that it was the doctor. Other nurses across all the war zones of the globe described the arduous and time-consuming nature of penicillin administration. Gertrude Cooper, a Queen Alexandra’s Royal Naval Nursing Service Sister, described the work entailed in administering it intramuscularly: ‘the penicillin was um, solid – it floats sufficiently to draw it up into a syringe already loaded with um – saline, and when this mixture was mixed it was given in the buttock’.150 According to Dyer, ‘it had to be given three hourly day and night which meant a constant flow of work preparing, sterilising, and giving injections and no sooner had we completed one round of injections to the various patients when it was time to start the next’.151 Salter’s testimony corroborates the elaborate and time-consuming work, administered as it was ‘at three hourly intervals under full aseptic conditions’.152 Even when the orders for strict asepsis were abandoned, the need for the drug to be given three hourly meant that the work remained time consuming. It would not have been possible, therefore, for the medical officers to continue to be the professionals who administered it. Nevertheless, their continued interest in its usage and the rapid involvement of the nursing staff in its administration suggest growing acknowledgement of the professional abilities and trustworthiness of nursing sisters.153 Critically, penicillin if administered early in the infection, whether that infection was caused by illness or injury, could return men very rapidly to war.154 The need for nurses to administer penicillin thus legitimated their place in volatile, front-line duty. Nursing sisters
were therefore able to ‘parlay’ their skills with this new technology to be included in forward areas.

The whole ethos of penicillin in the Second World War seems to have been one of inter-professional participation. PMRAFNS Sister Joan Peake recalled that the chemists in the pharmacy at her Cairo hospital made ‘primitive penicillin by growing a mould on jam, pots of jam, used to sterilise it and send it up to use and we used to use it on desert sores, with exceptionally good results’. By December 1943, the *British Medical Journal* was detailing that such practices were not supported: ‘the Mediterranean Report urges strict control of supplies, with concentration in one theatre of operations, and gives no encouragement to the supporters of crude penicillin’. According to Cynthia Toman, having learnt about penicillin on active service overseas alongside their medical colleagues, Canadian nursing sisters returned to civilian practice in the post-war era and there played an important role in teaching medical staff about the drug.

Such activity altered both gender and professional boundaries in a way that would have not been considered possible prior to the Second World War. There is no evidence in the personal testimonies of British nurses that this was mirrored in Britain. However, it is likely, given the close involvement of nursing sisters in all war zones in the preparation, administration and monitoring of penicillin, that they were called upon to train nurses and doctors who had not been on active service overseas in its use.

**Conclusion**

The constantly shifting requirements of war nursing prevented Army nurses from remaining in a professional comfort zone of accepted roles and regimes. The experience of living with uncertainty may have caused anxieties for some, but the active participation in new treatment modalities suggests that nurses who went to war were keen to move beyond the normal boundaries of nursing practice and many relished the opportunity to do so. The chapter has examined a range of surgical practices by way of a ‘case study’ of changing nursing roles. Whether they arose from traditional nursing work that was altered by the exigencies of war, were work that the over-stretched but now trusting medical staff passed on to nursing sisters or were roles that
by reason of their novelty were developed by the medical and nursing staff as a team, the new responsibilities raised the nurses’ sense of their professional ability.

Despite the increased confidence and autonomy in practice, the war was not the watershed for nursing that some have argued. Some of the extended, expanded and new work was, by the end of the war, enshrined into nursing practice; other work was reclaimed by and returned to medicine. The differentiations of these working practices, and the reasons why some were given gladly to the nurses, such as blood transfusion work, while other work was closely regarded at the end of the war by medics, have been the subject of a number of texts. What was critical to the professional lives of British Army nurses who were posted overseas during the Second World War was that, despite the challenges inherent in the negotiations of work and gender boundaries, they were changed by them. For many, in the aftermath of war, a return to the stifled world of the British hospital nursing system was not possible, and many sought alternatives.
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