Army Barracks in the United Kingdom


ARMD BARRACKS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: A BRIEF REVIEW OF THEIR GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

BY

Lieut.-Colonel T. A. PACE, O.B.E., B.Sc., M.D., D.P.H.

Royal Army Medical Corps

INTRODUCTION

BRITISH Army Barracks erected within the last twenty years may well be regarded as the unmarried soldiers' "Ideal Home." Their siting, design and construction have all been based on sound scientific principles in accordance with the current theory and practice of the hygiene of buildings. Intended primarily as a home, they conform to the modern trend in public health which considers suitable housing as one of the main factors in the maintenance and promotion of physical and mental health, and accordingly they incorporate all those amenities which contribute so much to the soldier's welfare and morale. Airy, well-lit barrack rooms, sitting rooms and canteens, drying rooms and cleaning rooms, barber's shops, gymnasium, swimming pools and playing fields—not to mention such essential requirements as artificial heating, modern sanitation, provision of hot water, up-to-date cooking facilities, etc.—all have become accepted by official authority as integral components of the soldier's present-day permanent accommodation.

But it was not always so.
Three centuries ago the very idea of permanent barracks was unknown. A hundred years later it had begun to spread, but was looked on with such disfavour by the general public that no government dared put it into execution, with the result that soldiers had to remain content with billets in taverns and public-houses. By 1853 the British Army had been installed in permanent barracks specially constructed for that purpose, but the accommodation provided was so primitive that the Royal Commission on the Sanitary State of the Army, reporting in 1858, declared that “a soldier’s barrack room at present has not the least pretension of the comforts of an ordinary dwelling-house, and, what is infinitely more disgraceful, there is not even the attempt made to introduce into it the decencies of civilized life.”

Well may the ghosts of Marlborough’s and Wellington’s soldiers look with awed incredulity on the spacious buildings where some of their successors live today!

In pre-Restoration times soldiers found their accommodation by the simple expedient of entering whichever private dwelling was found suitable. It was not considered necessary to request permission from the owner, or to compensate him in any way.

When the Standing Army was formed in 1660, the soldier's pay was intended to cover all expenses, and he was therefore expected to make his own private arrangements for board and lodging, and to pay for them out of his own pocket. This naturally resulted in a wide dispersal of troops, since they were allowed to lodge wherever their fancy took them. But with the gradual evolution of the regimental system, it was found increasingly necessary to ensure that men belonging to the same regiment should keep together as much as possible in order that they might be easily located and made available at short notice. It was this need of controlling the soldier’s whereabouts which gave rise to the practice of billeting, for it enabled a regimental commander to lay down exactly where his men would be quartered.

From the very earliest days, the question of the lodging of troops had been the cause of endless friction between the civilian population and the Army. The ordinary citizen objected most strongly to being compelled to “be Burthened with the Sojourning of Souldiers” against his will, a measure which was universally regarded as an unconstitutional encroachment on the liberty of the subject. This grievance had been aired as far back as 1628 in the Petition of Rights (3 Car. 1, 1): “and whereas of late great Companies of Souldiers and Mariners have been dispersed into divers Counties of the Realme, and the inhabitants against their will have been compelled to receive them into their houses, and there to suffer them to sojourne against the Laws and Customs of this Realme and to the great grievance and vexacion of the people... They doe therefore humblie pray your most excellent Majestie... that your Majestie would be pleased to remove the said Souldiers and Mariners and that your people may not be soe burthened in tyme to come.” Nor was the attitude of the civilians made any more
favourable by the frequent instances where the troops behaved badly or evaded payment for their billets. The unfortunate soldier, on the other hand, often had a legitimate cause for complaint in the miserable accommodation and vile food which he often received from the unwilling "host" on whom he found himself quartered.

It was not until 1670-71 that the billeting of soldiers on civilians was first legally authorized by a Royal Warrant, which singled out "victualling-houses, taverns and ale-houses" as the most suitable places for quartering troops. In Ireland, presumably on account of a general shortage of public-houses (vide infra), soldiers were often billeted on the premises of bakers, butchers and chandlers. It is easy to see why these various types of establishments, connected in one way or another with the provision of victuals, received official "patronage," so to speak, as a favourite billeting place; it meant that the soldier would not have to go far afield in search of means of subsistence. Before long it became a well-established custom to quarter troops as a first choice in public-houses and, if these were not sufficient in number, in private dwellings.

The compulsory aspect of billeting, however, whether legalized or otherwise, remained as unpopular as ever, and in view of increasing and widespread opposition it was found necessary to pass an Act of Parliament (31 Car. 2, 1) in 1679, laying down that "noe Officer Military or Civill nor any Person whatever shall ... presume to place quarter or billet any Souldier or Souldiers upon any subject or Inhabitant of this Realm of any Degree Quality or Profession whatever without his consent and that it shall and may be lawfull for every such Subject and Inhabitant to refuse to sojourne or quarter any Souldier or Souldiers notwithstanding any Command Order or Billeting whatever." By abolishing the principle of compulsion, this Act redeemed billeting of its most objectionable feature, but unfortunately it was largely nullified by the outbreak, a few years later, of the war against France and of the rebellion in Ireland. The movement of a large army to the sea-ports, which these events involved, brought in its train an urgent need of quarters, and resort was had once more to the practice of compulsory billeting. Eventually the latter developed to such an alarming extent and was giving rise to such a public outcry that it became imperative once more to give it legal sanction, but this time restricting it only to public-houses. This was done under the Mutiny Act (1 William and Mary, 4) of 1689: "... forasmuch as at this present time there is a Rebellion in Ireland and a War against France whereby there is occasion for the Marching of many Regiments, Troops and Companies in several Parts of this Kingdom towards the Sea Coasts and otherwise Bee it further enacted. ... That for and during the Continuance of this Act and noe longer It shall and may be Lawfull ... to Quarter and Billet the officers and soldiers in their Majesties Service in Inns, Livery Stables, Ale-houses, Victualling Houses and all Houses selling Brandy, Strong-Waters, Syder or Methglin by Retaile to be drunke in their Houses and noe other and in no Private Houses whatsoever ...." To prevent abuse, it added that "... the officers and Soldiers see Quartered and Billeted ... shall pay such reasonable Prices as shall be appointed from time to time by the Justices of the Peace ... for
all necessary Provisions . . .,” and reaffirmed that no officer or soldier was “to be quartered or billeted in any Private House without the consent of the Owner or Occupier.”

But no amount of legislation could hope to win over the people to a measure which was by its very nature so obnoxious, and which contained the seed of so much friction and strife between “Town and Redcoat.” The civilian resented it on principle, while failure by the soldier to pay for his billet became an increasingly common abuse. It was gradually becoming apparent that the only remedy to the quartering of troops on an unwilling population was the construction of sufficient permanent barracks to accommodate the Army. This solution, however, was not so simple as it looked, for the very mention of the word “barracks” at that time was, to use Fortescue’s phrase, “anathema in England”: it necessarily implied the perpetuation of a strong standing army, to which the man in the street had a very deep-rooted objection indeed.

The word “barracks” was originally derived from the Spanish “barraca,” meaning a hut, and the first occasion when the British Army obtained first-hand experience of “barracks” or “Spanish Quarters” was in 1659, when the garrison of Dunkirk took up accommodation in special buildings originally constructed by the Spanish troops.

Some sort of barracks, it is true, had already begun to make their appearance in the “garrison” towns of England, and one finds the word mentioned in the “English Military Dictionary” (1702) under the following entry: “Barrack, a Hut, like a little cottage, for Soldiers to lie in the Camp.” Such barracks as there were, however, were purely nominal, intended only for the small “garrisons” assigned to special fortresses like the Tower of London, Portsmouth, etc. Thus by 1704 the total barrack accommodation was sufficient for no more than 5,000 men, while by 1792 barracks in forty-three different garrisons and fortresses provided accommodation for a maximum of only 21,000 troops. This total was hopelessly inadequate, for in the absence of a Police Force, and with the growing industrial discontent in the manufacturing towns, the need for small bodies of troops in several towns in order to maintain the King’s peace was increasing every day.

As a matter of fact, sanction for the construction of permanent barracks was first obtained in 1697, but such construction was strictly limited to Ireland, and it is interesting to record that the sole reason behind this measure appears to have been the fact that ale-houses in Ireland were not sufficient in number (mirabile dictu!) to allow for the quartering of the garrison.

Meanwhile, the situation in England towards the close of the eighteenth century was that the overwhelming majority of troops were still split up in small detachments, scattered all over the country and billeted in taverns and inns. In 1792, therefore, Pitt decided to build new barracks throughout the British Isles: but he realized only too well that assent to such a far-reaching scheme would never be forthcoming from Parliament, and instead of laying the proposal before the House in the normal way, he decided to charge the cost involved against the vague item of “Extraordinaries of the Army.”
The building of permanent barracks duly began, and in 1793 the office of a Barrackmaster-General, whose express duty was to supervise the construction of suitable buildings for housing the Army, was created by Royal Warrant. Everything was set for a vast programme of barrack construction, and it must have gladdened Pitt's heart to notice that his measure appeared to receive the official blessing of *The Times* which, in its issue of 17th October, 1793, stated: "Quartering soldiers upon the inhabitants has long been a subject of complaint. Barracks, therefore, must be a popular measure, because it eases the poor and the industrious of a very great burden." Even so, the piloting of a course between the Scylla of billeting and the Charybdis of barrack construction was still precarious. *The Times* itself, although still in favour of barracks, must have had a slight twinge of conscience about the constitutional propriety of the measure, as may be gathered from the following entry in its issue of 6th December, 1793: "The want of a general erection of barracks is severely felt by the public in the country towns on whom the troops are quartered. To have a soldier put into a man's house and to be obliged to board and lodge him, is certainly more unconstitutional than to erect a house for the reception of those troops."

It was to be expected, therefore, that the erection of barracks would not go forward unopposed, and there was more than one occasion when the inhabitants of a town actually protested against the proposal to construct barracks in their midst, and requested that they be either not built at all or at least erected on unwanted or waste land on the outskirts of the town. Slowly but surely, however, the building programme made steady progress, and by 1805 sufficient accommodation for a total of 146,000 infantry and 17,000 cavalry had been provided in about 200 barracks. Thus it came about that, within the space of a decade or so, the soldier's quarters were gradually transferred from public-houses, inns and taverns to permanent barracks.

II

It is a sad commentary on the official attitude of the day that the comfort and welfare of the British soldier had no bearing whatever on the decision to provide him with permanent barracks. The chief motive that Pitt had in mind was, as has been pointed out, the impelling need to find a solution to the chronic friction with civilians over the question of billeting.

As regards the actual siting of barracks, this was dictated originally either by a lack of available billets, as for example in sparsely populated areas, or, as in the case of industrial towns, by the need to maintain a concentration of troops ready to come to the aid of the civil power in the event of riots.

The barracks themselves were drab, dingy, depressing buildings, built in the form of a square round a central parade ground, and surrounded by a high wall. As was to be expected in an age which had not yet heard of Chadwick's "Sanitary Idea," they were badly constructed, and, of course, grossly over crowded.

Such things as scales of floor area or cubic area did not exist, and cases were by no means uncommon where barrack rooms with a floor area of 600 sq. ft. were
intended to sleep 64 men. Little wonder that in certain instances the spacing between beds was less than six inches!

The so-called "beds" were large wooden cribs, often double-bunked, each taking four men. Single iron bedsteads did not become a general issue until well after Waterloo, as one of the several improvements introduced by the Duke of Wellington while he was Commander-in-Chief. As Fortescue rightly remarks, in fact, the Duke's epitaph might well have been, "He gave the British soldier a bed to himself."

Apart from the wooden beds, the only other item of furniture was a long wooden table running along the centre of the barrack room, where the men ate, drank—and cleaned their equipment. Very often, the foot of the beds came to within two inches of this table. No heating of any kind was provided, and windows and doors were therefore kept hermetically sealed day and night in an effort to keep warm; as a result, ventilation was virtually non-existent. The only illumination was by a "couple of 'dips,'" which only made the barrack room look darker still and by the light of which it was impossible for the men to read, or to pursue any occupation except smoking." (Florence Nightingale.)

There were no ablution rooms, dining rooms or recreation rooms. The only source of water was a pump in the open. Sanitation was of the most primitive kind, consisting of open cess-pools directly adjoining the barracks. A wooden tub was provided in each barrack room as a night urinal: after being emptied first thing in the morning, and then filled with water, it provided the only receptacle where the men could perform their ablutions!

Such was the sombre, tragic tale so tersely and forcefully summed up in Fortescue's trenchant words: "On being passed into barracks, the soldier found himself infamously housed."

III

This state of affairs continued, with slight changes, right through the first half of the nineteenth century.

Thus, a return prepared by the Barrack Department in 1848 revealed that, out of 343 barracks in the United Kingdom, not more than 59 allowed for a minimum of 450-500 cubic feet per man. The majority allowed for 400-450 cubic feet, while for the rest of the country the figures, as Professor W. A. Guy remarked when commenting on this return in 1858, were "... still more disreputable. At Chatham and Upnor the Infantry were put upon the miserably short allowance of 220 cubic feet of air per man ..., the Cavalry at Maidstone were doomed to 174 cubic feet, and the soldiers in Dover Castle must have been rotting, like sheep in the marshes, in a filthy atmosphere, measured out at the starvation rate of 147 cubic feet per man." These figures may be compared with the allowance prevailing at the time in work-houses (480 cubic feet per bed) or in St. Giles model lodging-house (542 cubic feet)!

In 1855 a Government Committee was appointed to examine the layout of existing barracks and to recommend necessary improvements. As a result, new
barracks constructed from then onwards afforded accommodation of an improved pattern, but no steps were taken to bring the older type of barracks up to the new standards.

It was not until the ghastly horrors of the Crimea were brought to light that an indignant nation eventually became aware of the miserable conditions which the long-suffering British soldier had been obliged to endure both in peace time and during war. From then on there was an insistent clamour for an improvement in the soldier’s environment, and the government of the day had no choice but to bow to informed opinion and carry out the necessary reforms.

In 1857 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire, among other matters, into the “Regulations affecting the Sanitary Condition of the Army.” Its members included the Right Hon. Sidney Herbert (afterwards Lord Herbert of Lea), Dr. Andrew Smith, the Director-General of the Army Medical Department, and Dr. Sutherland, who had been a member of the Board of Health. Their report, laid before Parliament in 1858, contained a glaring account of the appalling conditions prevailing in army barracks at that time, and of their bad effect on the health of the unfortunate troops who were obliged to live in them.

It was shown, for example, that, largely as a result of overcrowding and insufficient ventilation, “while in civil life at the soldiers’ ages, the deaths by pulmonary diseases are 6.3 per 1,000, they amount in the cavalry to 7.3; in the infantry of the line to 10.2; in the Guards to 13.8 per 1,000. . . .” Nor did this represent the true picture, for, as the Commissioners pertinently pointed out, a large number of soldiers were being continually invalided out on account of pulmonary disease, so that when they eventually died of the disease they helped to swell the civilian mortality figures and to diminish those of the army in proportion.

The Commissioners had some scathing comments to make on the deplorable state of affairs which their investigations brought to light. On the question of accommodation they stated that “it ought not to be possible to say . . . that a soldier never knows a healthy home, as regards air and space, till he commits some crime which brings him into the thoroughly ventilated cell of a military prison,” and that “paupers are better lodged than our soldiers.”

The following recommendations regarding barracks were submitted by the Committee:

1. A minimum cubic capacity of 600 cu. ft. per man.
2. A minimum interval between beds of 3 ft.
3. Provision of adequate ventilation.
4. Replacement of urine tubs by external urinals on the water carriage system, or by chamber pots.
5. Abolition of cess-pools, and the installation of proper drainage.
6. Provision of an abundant water supply.
7. Installation of artificial heating.
8. Introduction of gas as a means of artificial lighting.
(9) Provision of separate ablution rooms, baths, dayrooms, laundry, drying rooms and workshops.

(10) Provision of kitchen equipment for baking, frying, etc.

(11) Construction of married quarters.

(12) Medical opinion, as regards both siting and planning, to be obtained before the construction of any new barracks.

These far-reaching proposals, incorporating the very latest principles of hygiene and sanitation then in vogue, were accepted, and, largely at the instigation of Florence Nightingale, a "Barrack and Hospital Improvement Commission" was appointed, charged with the duty of supervising the implementation of all the necessary improvements and alterations. The Commissioners inspected existing barracks throughout the British Isles, and prepared a series of interim reports, followed by a final "General Report" which was laid before Parliament in 1861.

At this stage it would not be altogether out of place to say a word about the influence of Florence Nightingale on the improvement of military barracks, for her name is, indeed, writ large on the health charter which nowadays covers all aspects of the soldier's accommodation. Her own ideas on the subject had crystallized as far back as 1857. In her will, prepared towards the end of that year, she directed that some of her effects should be utilized towards the construction of a model barracks which was to incorporate "day-rooms for the men, separate places to sleep in . . . lavatories, gymnastic places, reading-rooms, etc . . . not forgetting the wives, but having a kind of Model Lodging House for the married men." One cannot help wondering, in view of these enlightened ideas and of Florence Nightingale's close collaboration with Sidney Herbert, how many of the recommendations of the 1857 Royal Commission were directly or indirectly due to her. But this was not all. Mention has already been made of the part she played in the appointment of the Barrack and Hospital Improvement Commission. The interim reports of this Commission, as well as their plans for new barrack construction, were submitted for her criticism and advice, while their General Report, especially where it deals with the principles of barrack construction, was largely her work. Again, it was due to pressure on her part that a special Barrack Works Committee was appointed in 1861 "to report as to measures to simplify and improve the system under which all works and buildings other than fortifications, are constructed, repaired and maintained, in order to give a more direct responsibility to the persons employed in those duties." Finally, it was through Florence Nightingale's insistence that the Improvement Commission, renamed the Army Sanitary Committee in 1862, was eventually made into a permanent body, directly responsible to the Secretary of State.

It was indeed fortunate for the British Army that Sidney Herbert became such an enthusiastic follower and disciple of Florence Nightingale, for in his capacity as Secretary of State for War he succeeded in inducing the Treasury—notoriously niggardly by tradition where the Army is concerned—to release sufficient funds for carrying out improvements which changed the accommoda-
tion of the private soldier beyond all recognition. This is how Florence Nightingale herself summed up these improvements in 1862: “These establishments have . . . been provided with combined ventilation and warming . . . . Drainage has been introduced . . . . Water supply has been extended, baths introduced . . . . and the lavatory arrangements generally improved. The . . . . kitchens have been completely remodelled; the wasteful cooking apparatus only fit for boiling, has been replaced by . . . . cooking ranges for roasting etc. . . . . Gas has been introduced . . . . instead of . . . ‘dips’ . . . . Many important structural alterations for increasing window light, circulating fresh air . . . , ventilating stables, abolishing ash-pits, etc., have been carried out.”

Admittedly, it was going to take time before all these dramatic changes were to become an accomplished fact in every single barracks throughout the land, and it could well be that, as time went on, the new standards would require further modification or improvement. But if the end of the road had yet to be reached, it was at least in sight. The authorities had at last realized that the proper siting and construction of barracks were something more than the mere provision of a roof over the soldier’s head, that they had a direct bearing on his health, and that the subject was of sufficient importance to justify the creation of a controlling and supervisory ad hoc body in the shape of the Army Sanitary Committee.

From now on, the Army Medical Department would include among its duties the keeping of a careful watch over the hygiene aspect of the soldier’s permanent home. Circumstances would no doubt arise, chiefly in the matter of finance, which, lying entirely outside the Department’s control, would hamper the speed or extent of barrack improvement or construction. But the two essential principles, that suitable accommodation is indispensable to the health of the Army, and that medical advice must be obtained and followed at all stages of barrack planning and construction, were now officially recognized.

No longer would British barracks be synonymous with urine tubs and with close, foul air, two evils which Farr referred to in 1861 as “the idols which had been heretofore worshipped . . . . and which have . . . . destroyed more men in the British Army than either the glittering steel, or the flashing artillery of its foes.”

Gone for ever were the days when joining the Colours meant, to echo Florence Nightingale’s poignant phrase, to “enlist to death in the barracks.”

It was the dawn of a new era in the history of the British Army.

IV

The last thirty years of the nineteenth century saw a vast expansion in the programme of barrack construction. The Military Forces Localization Act of 1872, the Barracks Act of 1890, and the Military Works Acts of 1897, 1899 and 1901, authorized the building of new barracks or the further improvement of existing ones. In every case, designs for the new buildings embodied progressive ideas which, subject only to the usual limitations of finance, were based on the latest school of thought.
War Office responsibility for barrack construction is shared between various departments. The Quartermaster-General’s Branch is responsible for planning, and is the final authority for all details of accommodation standards, which are worked out by the Barrack Synopsis Committee. The Directorate of Fortifications and Works is responsible for the preparation of designs, and for actual construction. The Directorate of Army Health gives expert advice on designs and on standards of accommodation.

Barracks are built according to a standard specification contained in “Barrack Synopsis,” a War Office publication, the first edition of which appeared in 1865, and which gives “statements of particulars based upon decisions which have, from time to time, been laid down by authority, as regards the military buildings authorized for various units, and the accommodation and fittings to be provided in connection therewith.” The Synopsis includes such data as the minimum floor area per man, the minimum height of rooms and the type and number of the various fixtures.

The actual design of barracks is based on a series of “Standard Plans” which are prepared at the War Office for all types of buildings; for example, barrack blocks, dining rooms, kitchens, etc. They are intended to avoid the need of preparing a brand new design every time that an army building has to be constructed.

Over-all medical supervision of general policy in connection with barracks is one of the duties of the Army Health Advisory Committee which, under the title of Army Hygiene Advisory Committee, came into being in 1919 as part of the Directorate of Hygiene at the War Office (now Directorate of Army Health) and replaced all former hygiene committees.

Both the Barrack Synopsis and the Standard Plans are kept continually under review, and amended or reviewed to keep them in line with current ideas. The design of barracks is, in effect, undergoing a constant evolution.

CONCLUSION

This short survey has traced the evolution of British Army barracks from earliest times.

And what of the future? Let the latest (1948) edition of “Barrack Synopsis” itself provide the answer in the following extract, which gives the existing scale of accommodation for a Barrack Block intended for the Male Rank and File.

BARRACK BLOCK (MALE RANK AND FILE)

1. Barrack blocks will normally be built in two storeys, though single storeys may be required.

2. Each floor will be self-contained, and will comprise bedrooms, toilet area, drying rooms, cleaning room and linen store (see note (a)). Each block will contain a sitting room and fuel store.

3. Bedrooms on each floor will be designed in the ratio of two 4-men rooms to three 8-men rooms. Individual bedrooms will be provided for corporals.
### Army Barracks in the United Kingdom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room etc.</th>
<th>Normal Area sq. ft.</th>
<th>Normal Height ft. in.</th>
<th>Special Fittings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Notice board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cupboards for cleaning utensils—one on each floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long mirrors (5 ft. x 1 ft.), one at each entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>Fixed shelves over each bed; built-in bedside lamp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms (corporal)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>Fixed shelf over bed; built-in bedside lamp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting room</td>
<td>3 per R. &amp; F., minimum 150</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>Amenity fireplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet area—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablution room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washbasins (h. and c.). Fixed mirrors running full length of washbasins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washing sinks (h. and c.) (minimum one per toilet area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drinking fountain (per toilet area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slipper baths (h. and c.) (minimum one per toilet area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shower baths (h. and c.) (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W.Cs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urinals (single).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bench, part slate, with raised edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electric iron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sink (h. and c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racking and hooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavatories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning rooms</td>
<td>80 plus 2 per R. &amp; F.</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen store (a)</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bench, part slate, with raised edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying room</td>
<td>1 per R. &amp; F.</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>Electric iron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sink (h. and c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calorifier room (if required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) A separate linen store will only be provided when the main Q.M. stores is not adjacent to the barracks block.

(b) This scale will be increased to 15 per cent. in sub-tropical and tropical climates.

A far cry, indeed, from the “infamous house” which was the soldier’s lot barely a century ago.
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AN INSTANCE OF THE GANSSER SYNDROME

BY

Lieutenant RONALD D. LAING
Royal Army Medical Corps
Psychiatric Division, Royal Victoria Hospital, Netley

The patient, M., aged 29, was referred to the Royal Victoria Hospital, Netley, for a psychiatric opinion on his fitness to undergo trial by court-martial on a charge of desertion. He had been absent without leave for seven months. From the patient himself, his parents, and army documents, the following history was constructed.

He was born after a normal pregnancy, and his childhood and school years passed without obviously unusual features, though he was not very bright at his lessons and did not play games. He has a younger brother aged 22 and a sister aged 25. His parents are both alive and in good health.

After a few semi-skilled jobs, he joined the Regular Army as a private in 1941. He had a clean record until his recent absence. On enlistment he was S.G. 3.

He married “in haste” nine years ago. There is one child, a boy of nine. He adored his wife at first, but their relationship soon deteriorated, largely, it appears, through his own bad temper and petty jealousy. While he was abroad from 1943 to 1945 his wife had a child by another man, and he obtained a divorce on the grounds of adultery in November, 1950. His wife retained the custody of their child.

In July, 1950, he was involved in a road accident and was in hospital for