

NEWSLETTER
OF THE

OPTOMETRIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

(243 North Lindbergh Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63141, U.S.A.)

Vol. 15-17

January 1984-86

Number 1

O.H.S. business matters:

Although the O.H.S. has sponsored frequent gatherings of its members and other history-minded persons at convenient opportunities such as during meetings of the American Academy of Optometry and of the American Optometric Association, it has been quite impossible to bring together all five members of the Executive Board at one sitting. Hence virtually all business has been handled by correspondence and telephone. On December 12, however, four of the five Board members plus your editor, were able to squeeze in a 7:00 A.M. breakfast business meeting in Houston, Texas, during the week of Academy sessions.

On this occasion the Board accomplished the signing of recognition certificates for two previously voted recipients, Martin Topaz and Grace Weiner. Aware that it was well behind schedule, so to speak, in its recognition of others who had contributed significantly to our awareness of optometry's heritage, the Board approved the granting of recognition certificates to six additional nominees, as follows: Maurice Cox, Israel Dvorine, O.D., Robert Graham, O.D., James R. Gregg, O.D., John R. Levene, Ph.D. (posthumously), and Jacob Staiman, O.D.

Considering the approximately doubled cost of postage and of preparation of the newsletter since its first issue (January 1970), and presuming that any replacement of, or assistant to, the present gratuitous editor should receive at least a token honorarium, the Executive Board voted to double the dues from the long standing \$5.00 per year to \$10.00 per year effective January 1, 1984.

California vs. Canada:

When to make the final count of ballots being returned from around the globe can mean waiting two or more months if the results are close to a tie. This is the way this O.H.S. Executive Board election looked for the first two or three weeks as candidates Dave Williams and Pat Carlson took turns leading. I gained some impression that Canadian and Californian O.H.S. members were simply voting for their favorite son or daughter, respectively. (I'm trying to hide my otherwise enjoyable chauvinism). Eventually, however, Patricia Carlson gained a lead that could not be offset by the few belated ballots that may still be arriving on the high seas.

Obviously each of the two candidates was favored by those who knew him or her well, but, regretfully, only one could be elected.

OPTOMETRY LIBRARY

MAR 16 1984

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

OPT
RE
951
.0627
V. 15
-17

Jc

The resultant five members of the Executive Board then lost no time electing officers for 1984, the same as for 1983. The new line-up is as follows, with years of termination on the Board in parentheses:

President: James P. Leeds, O.D. (1987)
Vice-President: Jerome J. Abrams, O.D. (1986)
Secretary-Treasurer: Maria Dablemont (1985)
Members: Patricia Carlson (1988)
Henry A. Knoll, Ph.D. (1984)

Two OHS members deceased:

News of the deaths of John R. Levene, Ph.D., and Antonio Pacheko, O.D., reached us just before this issue went to the printers. Readers will recall that John, a British trained optometrist, was a founding member of the O.H.S. Executive Board, a President, several times Editor of the newsletter, a frequent contributor to the newsletter, and earned his Ph.D. degree at Oxford University in science history. He was born in 1929.

Tony, a proud Puerto Rican who received his professional training at the Pennsylvania College of Optometry, probably recruited more OHS members than anyone else, frequently contributed items of facts and statistics to our newsletter, and made the unchallenged claim of having the numerically largest family name in optometry. He was born in 1923.

History interests all kinds:

A flurry of ten new O.H.S. members immediately followed the mailing of the October issue of this newsletter. While no attempt is made in this newsletter to list all new, or even continuing members, the assortment in this instance reinforces the typical composition of our farflung and diverse membership. Represented in the list, which follows, are three countries, six states and a commonwealth, two continents and an island, four professions, both sexes, and at least a 40 year age range.

Mr. Collin Eldridge
Apothecaries' Hall
Black Friars Lane
London, ECV4 6EL
England

Barbara A. Fink, O.D.
1405 Cond. Townhouse
Rio Piedras, PR 00923

Tole N. Greenstein, O.D.
7831 S.E. Lake Road
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Ron Jensen
Indiana University
School of Optometry
800 East Atwater
Bloomington, IN 47405

W. M. Lyle, Ph.D.
School of Optometry
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario
Canada N2L 3G1

Charles W. McQuarrie, O.D.
44847 10th St. West
Lancaster, CA 93534

Jay Messinger, O.D.
4117 Bledsoe St.
Culver City, CA

John Robinson, O.D.
Box 323
Creston, IA 50801

Gordon R. Shaw, O.D.
2970 N. Jasper St.
Decatur, IL 62526

J. Baxter Swartwout, O.D.
Route 7 at Park Avenue
Latham, NY 12110

To save or not to save:

That is the question that we all face quite daily. It is the only barrier between a hand grasp and a waste basket within arm's length.

Some of us avoid the multiple crises by tossing away everything that has no continuing utility. Others of us manifest the pack-rat syndrome by saving everything, some even organizing the storage areas for retrieveability. In between is the somewhat less decisive group of us who make a conscientious effort to sort out the items which may have archival value or, more popularly, may become so-called collectors' items.

Within that in-between group are those of us who conscientiously become a bit frustrated when the decision to save may be regarded as totally silly and the decision not to save may be the utter destruction of the only clue to an answer of historical significance. The manner in which such decisions are finally consummated is not unlike that to dispose of a gum wrapper at the queen's reception.

Perhaps the most admirable of all, however, are those of us who indulge in "buck-passing" the difficult questions by simple donation of the items in question to a museum, collector, or archivist for final decision.

So it is with a small carton of about 400 file cards placed on my desk recently by my colleague Charles Shick with the note, "Bob Corns asked that I give you this box full of old Board tests. He thought that you might want them for the archives. If you don't think they might be useful he said you should toss them."

Hmmm!

Each card has typed on it an Indiana Optometry State Board question, usually with a suggested answer and its dates of utilization, all between 1947 and 1954.

Of what possible archival value could these be? Well, it was only a few years ago that I was suggesting to a student that one way to answer his question on trends in optometric science would be to compare state board examination questions of different periods in our history. Such questions were of course rarely if ever published. Some were collected in exclusive fraternity files but not readily accessible to nonmembers. To the best of my knowledge the student's project was abandoned.

I recall once hearing a lecture by a retired chemistry professor who described some of the chemistry he was taught a half century earlier. It was a startling revelation of progress possible in a single lifetime.

Needless to say, I am "passing this buck" to ILAMO, together with a copy of this commentary.

On the apple of one's eye:

O.H.S. member David Cline, O.D., who continually scans the literature for terms that should be included in the Dictionary of Visual Science, of which he is a co-editor, wrote to tell us that in the preface of "Little Dorrit" by Charles Dickens, Heritage Club Edition, 1956, Dickens is quoted as having written to Mrs. Richard Watson in 1855, "Catherine tells me that you want to know the name of my new book. It will not be made public until the end of October, the title is--NOBODY'S FAULT--keep it as the apple of your eye--an expressive form of speech, though I have not the least idea of what it means."

Dr. Cline reminds us that Dickens did not have the benefit of the great Oxford English Dictionary which tells us that the apple of the eye is "the pupil or circular aperture in the center of the eye through which the dark retina is seen, so called, because it was supposed to be a circular body." The O.E.D. states also that the term is "Used as a symbol of that which is cherished with the greatest regard" and traces its use back to A.D. 885 with subsequent citations dated in the years 1300, 1483, 1535, 1586, 1600, 1602, 1753, and 1816. The origin and rationale are nevertheless unexplained.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary, unabridged, is much less informative.

Dickens's comment may still be appropriate!

Brief history of the C.I.E.:

The Commission Internationale de l'Eclairage (C.I.E.) in its present form began in 1913 with the restructuring of its predecessor, the International Commission on Photometry (CIP), which was founded on September 3, 1900, at the Paris meeting of the International Gas congress. Its formation was prompted especially by the need to study the problem of photometry of incandescent gas mantles.

The first CIP session held in Zürich in June 1903 was attended by 14 people. At the fourth session in Berlin in 1913 the entire time was devoted to a discussion of the draft of new statutes to govern a much broadened organization, the C.I.E. In recent years the quadrennial international sessions have approached the 1,000 mark in attendance.

The organizational history and some of the C.I.E. accomplishments are described by Sylvester K. Guth in the July 1983 issue of the CIE-Journal, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 2-5. Dr. Guth acknowledges that much of his article is based upon the detailed History of the CIE by J.W.T. Walsh, which covers the period from 1900 to 1962.

To learn your heritage:

One of the largest genealogical collections in the United States is in the Allen County Public Library, 900 Webster Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802. Its Reynolds Historical Genealogy Collection is rapidly approaching two hundred thousand volumes. Included are family genealogies, community histories, indexes to births, deaths, marriages, cemetery inscriptions, and wills, maps, flat books, heraldry references, census population schedules, boat passenger lists, city directories, military pension records, bibliographies, etc. The Reading Room has numbered seating to accommodate eighty researchers. The Department maintains a list of professional genealogists who can be contacted personally regarding their fees and research desired.

Complementing the Department is the Allen County Genealogical Society of Indiana, P.O. Box 12003, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46862, which anyone may join. The annual dues are \$9.00.

Beginning of the contact age:

The 60th anniversary of TIME was celebrated in the October 5, 1983, issue, vol. 122, no. 15, with 86 editorial pages of the magazine filled with brief accounts of major events and other significant happenings from 30 selected years of the 60. On page 51, devoted to the year 1930, under the caption of MEDICINE is the following:

Members of the Optometrical Society of the City of New York peered inquisitively last week at Grace Robin, 22, near-sighted Brooklyn stenographer. Pleasantly but glassily Grace Robin peered back. She did not appear to be wearing eyeglasses, yet she was, right against her eyeballs--contact glasses, such as had never been seen by the New York Society.

Grace Robin should now be 75. It would be fascinating to hear her account of the occasion.

Contact lenses from 1930 to 1950:

"The Max Schapero Lecture: Contact Lens Horizons" is the title of an article in the October 1983 issue of the American Journal of Optometry and Physiological Optics, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 851-858, in which Solon M. Braff, O.D., reminisces in conversational detail his awareness of developments as one who was himself intimately involved in almost every aspect. Though reminiscing, he relies heavily on contemporary published accounts to enhance his memory.

Thought evaders:

Considerably mangled, perhaps by having been carried in a vast pocket and very frequently consulted, are the remains of a book of only 9 x 6 cm page size, in Dr. James Leeds' collection. It was quite obviously used as a mnemonic by an ophthalmic optician or perhaps by a student or apprentice preparing for his or her qualifying examination. The remaining pages are nos. 17-28, 33-106, and 109-112 still loosely tied together by the bookbinding cord.

Pages 17-28 are mostly mnemonic phrases to help one remember anatomical information, such as "Low spheres exciting pain frequently need most careful refraction"= "Lachrymal, Supraorbital, Ethmoid, Palpebral, Frontal, Nasal, Muscular, Ciliary, and Retinae centralis" branches of the ophthalmic artery. The section on OCULAR AFFECTIONS, pages 33-54, includes, for example, "Hide intoxicants after ten" for "Hyperaemia, Inflammation, Atrophy, and Tumours" of the optic nerve.

Pages 53 and 92 advertise "Lowings' Orthoptic Training Charts" published by "J. & F. Fleming, Ltd." at "146, Clerkenwell Road, London, E.C.1."

Pages 55-62 cover MYDRIATICS AND CYCLOPLEGICS, and pages 63-92 OPTICAL FORMULAE. All subsequent pages provide standards for nomenclature recommended by "The Ophthalmic Optical Standards Committee and adopted by the Institute of Ophthalmic Opticians and The Association of Wholesale and Manufacturing Opticians."

From the several illustrations of bridges and temples one can estimate that this was published very early in the present century.

The Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers:

This is the title of a history of the oldest functioning optical (optometric) body in the world, chartered in 1629 by Charles I. It is authored by Frank W. Law, who in turn credits Mr. Brian Bevan with collecting the bulk of the material. Published in 1979, quite evidently by the W.C.S.M., it consists of 126 pages of detailed, well organized, and documented chronology of the functions, roles, rituals, challenges, and tribulations experienced in its 350 years of existence. The appendices include the citation of the original 1628 petition for a charter, the charter itself (8 pages!), the 1950 grant of arms, a chronological list of masters of the company since its incorporation with 20 or more marked as having "served the office of Lord Mayor of London," the 1955 petition for a supplemental charter by Queen Elizabeth, and a chronological list of the Clerks of the Company whose tenures ranged from one to 55 years.

The address of the W.C.S.M. is Apothecaries' Hall, Black Friars Lane, London EC4V 6EL. The Company now published a newsletter entitled From the Master and Wardens, with no. 7 of vol. 1 appearing in May 1983, "for private circulation to Freeman of the Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers."

Historic Microscope replicated:

Carl Zeiss, Inc. offers a limited-edition, working replica of a famous Zeiss microscope, the Stativ VII, for museums and private collectors. Handcrafted in burnished brass, this exact replica of the original manufactured by Carl Zeiss in the 1880's is both a functioning instrument and an impressive display piece of historic interest. One thousand Stativ VII replicas are being produced.

The Stativ VII was among the first microscopes to have optics that were produced according to mathematical principles developed by Ernst Abbe of Carl Zeiss, Germany. Abbe's pioneering research into microscopic imaging revolutionized the manufacture of microscopes and made possible the large-scale production of quality instruments. The Stativ VII gained wide use in laboratories throughout the world during the great age of discovery in the biological, chemical and physical sciences in the years following 1880.

One of these discoveries was that of the tubercle bacillus, made in 1882 by Robert Koch. Zeiss decided to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of this milestone in medical history by offering an exact reproduction of an instrument of that period.

The Stativ VII reproduction comes with a 10X eyepiece a set of 3X, 8X, and 40X objectives. Each replica is numbered and is housed in an attractive mahogany case, together with a set of specimen slides. For those who wish to duplicate the important tests by which Abbe demonstrated his theory of microscope imaging, a diffraction kit and instructions are also included. The price, complete, is \$1,750.

Information on availability can be obtained by contacting your nearest Zeiss dealer or Carl Zeiss, Inc., One Zeiss Drive, Thornwood, NY 10594, (914) 747-1800.

Luminescent enlightenment:

Very incidental to visual science but increasingly relevant to optometry is luminescence and its many applications. Its technological development is represented in an International Organizing Committee of 15 members from nine countries which supervises the International Conferences on Luminescence. The seventh congress, briefly ICL 84, is scheduled for August 13-17, 1984, in Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A., and is cosponsored by the University of Wisconsin, the Optical Society of America, and the Union of Pure and Applied Physics in cooperation with several other organizations and with financial support from 32 industrial firms.

Its history?

According to a brochure entitled FIRST CALL FOR PAPERS, "The Conference on Luminescence had its origin in Warsaw (1936) and in Oxford (1938), initially as a small symposium of researchers interested in the field of luminescence. These gatherings were revived after World War II, when the first postwar meeting was held in England once again. Since then, because of the growth of interest in and increasing technical importance of luminescence, the conference has thrived in size and scope. The mechanisms and the structure needed to transform the Conference into one of international standing were assembled in 1966 at the meeting in Budapest; since then it has become known as the International Conference on Luminescence (ICL)."

Seventy years ago:

"Early Days in Optics" by J.H. Lucas in the October 8, 1983, issue of The Ophthalmic Optician, vol. 23, no. 20, pp. 642-643, is a brief and personal account of the author's entrée into his ophthalmic optical/optometric career. As a finishing "schoolboy" in 1913 he responded to an advertisement by a Mr. Crowther who practiced in Wimbledon, England. His first pay was a "generous" 7s 6d per 50 hour work week, "to keep the place neat and tidy, then to make up spectacles and pince-nez from the dozens of little white boxes labeled with the power of the lenses and their size and shape."

He also related his preparations for certification by studies under the supervision of Mr. Crowther and "a French gentleman who gave classes from his home in Brixton." Following service in World War I he continued course work at the London Refraction Hospital and "in the optics department of the University of London," eventually to be certified by the British Optical Association. He closes with, "I wonder whether the young men and women of the present generation experience the same wonder and joy in the gaining of their qualifications as we did in the early days."

Try me again, Jim:

Ever to test the inflexible firmness of our friendship O.H.S. President Jim Leeds and I have been conducting a titillating vendetta concerning the series of three 1937 Reader's Digest "Optometry on Trial" articles on which I commented in the July 1983 issue of the N.O.H.S. Feeling exactly as I do about the historical significance of these articles he repeatedly urged me to rerun them in the N.O.H.S., or else simply to include copies with one of our quarterly mailings. Exercising my editorial independence I persistently declined to do so, each time stating one or more reasons such as I typically dredge up to suit the occasion. Both of us a bit annoyed by the impasse, we agreed that I would comply if he would get the endorsement of the O.H.S. Executive Board and permission from the copyright holders of the magazine. Aha, he thought he had me, and so he immediately contacted the Reader's Digest publishers. Prompt response came from the Editorial Rights and Permissions Manager Esther Carr as follows, "We enjoyed reading your letter, but I'm afraid we have to disappoint you. Rights to the three articles by Roger William Riis are unclear and we cannot give reprint permission to anyone."

However, let me mitigate Jim's disappointment by again reminding our curiosity-driven readers that the original Reader's Digest articles (vol. 31, Aug., Sept., & Oct.) are quite available in major public libraries. Also, ILAMO, Inc., will provide single photocopies quite legally on request for a nominal copying and mailing charge.

I must agree with Jim's closing shot, "I still say there are a hell of a lot of people out there under 60 who know very little about the whole brouhaha."

About Charles Sheard, 1883-1963

On November 5 and 6, 1983, the College of Optometry and the Graduate School of The Ohio State University sponsored the Charles Sheard Centennial Symposium on Vision Science. On this occasion Sheard's daughter, Mrs. Dorothy Sheard Allen, was invited to speak. In preparation for her remarks she wrote a paper entitled "Some Remembrances of my Father, Charles Sheard," a 13 page document. Dean Frederick W. Hebbard has made plenty of copies of that document for general distribution. For your complimentary copy write Dr. Hebbard at the O.S.U. College of Optometry, 338 West 10th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. It provides an intimate glimpse of the personal and family life of the man.

At the program itself Mrs. Allen spoke entirely from longhand notes which she prepared quite separately from the above-mentioned document. I prevailed on her to let me have these for the N.O.H.S. Here they are:

It is indeed a great pleasure for me to be with you as we honor my father during the centennial year of his birth and as we gather together to celebrate the joyous occasion of the rededication and renaming of the College of Optometry building for Glenn Fry.

It would be presumptuous of me to pretend to you scientists that I truly understand all Father's scientific work. I do understand the philosophy which inspired it. Father was a born and bred teacher and a bit of a preacher. He believed that each of us should give to the world the best one has to give. He chose to give his best through the art and science of vision which he said was "the most precious gift we have been given."

Father's own words speak better for him than I can, so I shall quote without specific identification from Dynamic Ocular Tests written while he was Professor of Physics and Applied Optics here at Ohio State; Life Giving Light, one of the Century of Progress series; and the Sheard Volume, both written while he was at the Mayo Clinic and Foundation. The first book is "dedicated to all men scientifically interested in ocular refraction" and I justly presume that this means each one of you.

You will note that I chose not to quote from Dynamic Skiametry. I do not, however, deny that I know the basic principle involved: that convergence and accommodation are accomplished best by testing both eyes together. Skiametry may not be part of my every-day thinking about Father, but dynamic is. Father said, "things static can never have the same fascination as things dynamic." He equated dynamic with energy and believed that energy is present in every form of life, and that one form supports another.

"Science becomes dynamic by the continuous development of new and fruitful concepts. Only a trained mind can appreciate or understand the conceptual schema. A trained mind has three attributes: a deep-seated and insatiable curiosity; an unfettered, unrestrained and ruthless imagination; and an unquenchable faith that there is law in the universe and harmony in nature." To put it in other words: "to define the indefinable, explain the inexplicable, and unscrew the inscrutable." "A trained mind thinks and thinks for itself."

Father compared scientists to detectives. He said that there are two methods of investigation, one the Baconian and the other that described by Descartes. In both methods, clues are investigated carefully. In the Baconian method, a major clue is decided upon and pursued vigorously. In the method of Descartes, a solution to a problem can be found only by thought, only by a trained mind as it sifts and evaluates clues.

Father quotes from James Conant as follows: "Science is to be regarded as a series of interconnected, conceptual schemes which arose originally from experimentation or careful observation and were fruitful of new experiments." Father goes on to say that "without new concepts there will be no advance in practical arts" and "that only in constant development of pure science will develop constant advance in practical arts." They should be busy co-operating the one with the other. This thought is repeated in the song the children's choir sang at Jan Masuryk's funeral: "The wheel broke, we'll have to strengthen the spoke." Father also wrote that a brick no matter how perfect it is to look at is no good unless it is being used to build.

In 1948, Father, talking to a group of generally well informed people, said he felt somewhat uneasy away from the scientific laboratory, that environment "with its freedom of thought, its doubting Thomas attitude, the search for some fragment of truth or some contribution to man's knowledge." Father made his contribution through his research in the field of vision.

"Vision of men's naked eye, keen and marvelous as it may be, has not been powerful enough either in its magnifying scope or resolving ability to bring the night with its many thousand eyes and the starry heavens nearer earth."

"The wonders of today are triumphs of modern science over baffling intricacies of environment, time, and space."

"The application of new ideas and new tools developed by the physicist and chemist to the study of biological problems has been one of the most important and fruitful undertakings of the last three decades"--written in 1933. "It is important to blend the science of biology with the science of men."

I must now speak for myself, for my brother Charles, who cannot be here because of illness, and Father's seven grandchildren and six great grandchildren. When I read Father's bibliography and see the names of the men and women with whom he worked, I realize anew Father's dedication to the concept that the working together of various disciplines is vital to the general benefit of mankind.

When I see the CBS ad for its new program in which they describe vision as "undertaking that which is not yet seen," I think of Father because I know that he had a foresight of things to come. I am sure he laid the groundwork for future experimentation.

I am glad that my children had the opportunity to spend a considerable amount of time with Father. They constantly remind me of things I took as a matter of course. Although they all remember going with Father to his laboratories, they remember also that Father never brought his work home. They remember too that Father never lay down to rest without a book in his hands. They also remember the lively arguments when they had to think why they thought as they did.

I think how excited Father would be by all the advancements that have been made in the last twenty years. He saw one of the earliest satellites, Echo by name, in 1961 or 62, and he said to me that it was only the beginning of a program whose development would lead to then unbelievable heights. How excited he would be by Pioneer.

I would be remiss were I not to thank Glenn Fry and Dean Hebbard for making it possible for me to be here for what is for me a very moving and thrilling time. I would be remiss too if I were not to say to you that I know that the speakers for the Sheard Centennial Symposium were chosen with great care by the men mentioned above. It has been my good fortune to know some of them personally, all of them by reputation. Robert Graham and I watched OSU defeat UCLA at the Rose Bowl!

I wish to thank all those who worked so hard to have what I call my essay ready for you to pick up today. It was a remarkable accomplishment because I am a foot dragger by nature.

One of the privileges which has become mine through the years is that a few special people who have been friends of my parents have become friends of mine. Among them are Martha and Glenn Fry. I am doubly happy that Glenn will give the first Charles Sheard Memorial Lecture on Vision Science this afternoon as we do honor to my Father for his scientific contributions to vision and to Glenn Fry for his continuing contributions to that same art.

I hold in high regard each of you who is here because I feel that you would not be here were you not interested in and concerned about the future of vision. I am aware that my optometrist now examined my eyes as he did forty years ago when I first began to wear glasses, but that he has acquired additional tools since that time.

I hope that my somewhat disconnected quotes from father's works have given you an idea of his deep philosophic concept of vision. I know that the lectures to be given here will add to your knowledge of the skills which make concepts and ideas become realities.

Thank you.

Academic fiction:

A few months ago I wrote Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, President of the Pennsylvania College of Optometry, to ask what he knew about the Philadelphia Optical College, whether it was still functioning, dormant, or terminated. He replied as follows:

To my knowledge, the Philadelphia Optical College has not functioned for quite a few years. It is not listed in the current Philadelphia telephone directory.

A source at the Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has informed us that in 1895 a law was passed that any institution chartered prior to that date had to fulfill certain qualifications. We are further informed that the Philadelphia Optical College never fulfilled any of the stipulated qualifications and, as a result, any degrees awarded after that date were considered bogus by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Historically, a technical institute styling itself "The Philadelphia Optical College" was chartered as early as 1892 by the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia for that purpose "of establishing an institution to furnish a course of instruction in optics and in the fitting of glasses for defective vision with power and authority to confer appropriate degrees". Although college files would indicate that degrees were conferred as late as 1960, it was not a school of optometry as the term was defined by an act of legislature in 1917.

Prior to this legislation, another venture, "Pennsylvania College of Ophthalmetry" at Reading, had been chartered (1904) by the Court of Common Pleas of Berks County for the "support and maintenance of an institution for teaching by correspondence or otherwise the science of ophthalmetry or the correction of defective vision by aid of lenses." This, however, appears to have expired at birth; for there is no evidence that the "college" opened its doors.

Quite separately I submitted a formal request to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Bureau of Corporations for a search of their corporation records. The following reply, dated November 7, 1983, was received from Wayne L. Dietrich, Director, Corporation Bureau, Department of State, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

"IN RE: PHILADELPHIA OPTICAL COLLEGE

"In response to your recent request, an examination of the indices in the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, fails to disclose thereon a corporation either Foreign or Domestic, or a registration under the provisions of the Fictitious Names Act, or a Limited Partnership bearing the name(s) of the above captioned."

A sociologist's view:

O.H.S. member Louis Orzack, Ph.D., a sociologist, calls our attention to a new book by Gerald V. Larkin, another sociologist, entitled Occupational Monopoly and Modern Medicine, Tavistock Publications, London and New York, 1983 (\$29.95). Professor Orzack points out that it "contains an interesting account of the growth of the ophthalmic opticians' specialty in Great Britain through about 1960, thus covering the attainment of state registration and reviewing controversies relating to competing definitions of overlapping boundaries with medicine. It is a worthwhile account, deserving of citation within the ranks of those interested in the scholarly analysis of the specialty."

A book of slightly more than 200 pages, it deals with aspects of four relatively small professions which relate to attempts of medical hegemony. The four groups, ophthalmic opticians, radiographers, physiotherapists, and chiropodists, were selected because each "in some way has a different relationship to medicine as a whole and to particular groups within it."

The "Ophthalmic opticians" chapter, the largest of the four, is based almost exclusively on information gleaned from British medical, ophthalmic optical, and government publications and personnel, with only two or three purely incidental citations from American or other-nation references. This is not a criticism, for it would merely have added unnecessary complexity to the author's theme to have included optometric-medical interrelationships around the world where definitive patterns are so varied. The underlying issues of sociological interest are probably the same in other national models.

Three other chapters deal with "Perspectives on professional growth," 23 pages, "Pressure for state registration," 23 pages, and "Conclusion," 19 pages. Altogether the book is well worth reading by anyone trying to gain a clearer perspective of optometric professional development in the sixty years following about the turn of the century.

Licensing board headaches, 1931-36:

Recently Ronald W. Wuensch, Executive Director of the Indiana Optometric Association, sent us a packet of "some historical material I gleaned from a 'throw-away' box from the Indiana State Optometry Board."

The contents were essentially items from the correspondence files of the Secretary of the Board for the period 1931-1936. They included letters from and to various optometrists, the Board's attorney, American Optometric Association attorney Harold Kohn, Indiana Governor Paul V. McNutt, the Attorney General of Indiana, and others. Included was an

Indiana State Association of Optometrists resolution urging the AOA to recommend that "the transition from optical departments in stores and from store fronts to office fronts be made gradually and in an orderly fashion but with all possible dispatch." The resolution had three "Whereases" and five "Resolveds." Also included was a March, 1935, summons of State Board Secretary John Davey to Superior Court of Marion County, and various reports of attorneys and inspections. Much of the correspondence related to complaints of modes of practice, types of advertising, or certain practitioners' lack of licenses. Then there was also a case of an itinerant optometrist suing The Prairie Farmer for criticizing her and her husband and referring to them as unreliable.

Altogether the packet gives insight to at least the tenor of a short period of optometry's sociological development 50 years ago.

The collection is being forwarded to ILAMO, Inc. for the archives, but, to share a bit of the material, the following three successive 1933 letters are reproduced here to illustrate a possibly amusing episode which at its time was still testing the very fibre of the registration law which had been enacted 26 years earlier.

Oakland City, Inc.
April 1, 1933.

Mr. Phillip Lutz. Atty. Gen.
Indianapolis, Ind.

My Dear Mr. Lutz:

Through the advice of my attorney and some of the more prominent medical doctors of our community I am submitting my case to you for advice. Your opinion will be highly appreciated and I will be guided by. And although you may not know me--I have met you and as a "neighbor" have the utmost confidence in you.

Here's the story: I was born here in Oakland City 1871. At the age of 21 I had graduated from our High School at 17, and had taken 3 year course in College. At the age of 21 I entered Bradley Polytechnic School at Peoria, Ill and took course in watchmaking and optics. Came home from Peoria and went in business in partnership with another man and went to work at watch repairing and fitting glasses. The year of 1907 the Legislature passed the Optometry law and gave licenses to all practitioners at the the time law was passed. As there was two of us in our store I did not apply for my exemption license and in the year of 1917 my partner moved to Evansville. Immediately the state board notified

me that I was unlicensed to sell glasses but I wrote them the circumstances and they said go ahead I was violating no law.

In 1931 the optical schools got around our Legislation and had an amendment added to the old law that no one who had not had a three year course could take the examination for optometrists license in the state.

So now just last week the Secy of The State Board of Optometry came down and ordered me to take down all my test types. Quit fitting glasses, not even send broken lenses to optical houses for replacement, and not assemble lenses and frames. Of course--after 40 years of actual practice, and with perfect satisfaction to my patients and the medical fraternity he had put me out of business at the age of 62. And you know that is not a very good age to start to learn a trade or profession.

The wholesale optical houses inform me that several cases have come up in different counties in the state similar to mine. And the judges have ruled in every case that the law is unconstitutional. But be that as it may I am out of business and have always been a law abiding citizen. So I intend to stay out until I can begin again legally.

Now what I want to know is your opinion of the legality of the law. And do you not think I am entitled to an exemption license? This at my age is of the utmost importance. I only have a good living and if they can law a fellow out of legitimate business at my age it don't seem hardly fair.

Your opinion in this matter will be highly appreciated and I shall abide by it. I was advised by some of your friends who happen to be my friends also to write you concerning this matter.

The Secy. of The State Board of Optometry says himself that I am entitled to an exemption license, but where I fell down was not applying for it at the right time. And he can-not let me pass the examination because the law says an applicant must have a 3 year course in some school of Optometry.

These legislatures sure do let the schools put it over on them some times. Anyone with a common school education and a good balanced brain can learn all there is to the laws of refraction in 3 months, just as well as he can in 3 years.

Thanking you in advance for your information I am

Very Truly Yours,

John H. Chappell

State of Indiana
Office of Attorney General
Indianapolis

May 20, 1933

Mr. J.R. Victor,
315 Main Street
Evansville, Indiana.

Dear Sir:-

I am writing you as Secretary of the Indiana State Board of Registration and Examination of Optometry. This office sometime ago received a letter from John H. Chappell, which I am enclosing for your information.

I have made some investigation into the statutes that have been enacted relating to the practice of Optometry. I have been unable to find such requirement as that mentioned in Mr. Chappell's letter, to-wit:- a requirement that the applicant must have had a three year course in Optometry before he should be allowed to take the examination for license.

In this connection, Section 13,812 Burns Revised Statutes, 1926, which statute is still in force, says that the applicant "shall pass an examination before the State Board of Examiners. Such examination shall be confined to such knowledge as is essential to the practice of Optometry. * * * All persons successfully passing such examination shall be registered in a record which shall be kept by the Secretary of said Board as licensed to practice Optometry, and shall also receive a certificate of such registration, to be signed by the President and Secretary of said Board."

The above statute contains no such requirement as is mentioned in Mr. Chappell's letter and I have been unable to find such requirement in any other sections of the Act as passed or amended.

I presume then, that if there is such a requirement in existence, that it has been established by the Board itself under the authority of Section I (a), Acts of 1929, Page 90. It seems to the writer that if such a requirement has been established by the Board, and if the Board had the authority to make such regulation, it likewise would have the authority to waive such requirement.

Section 13816 Burns Revised Statutes, 1926, provides that "every person who has been engaged in the actual and continuous practice of optometry as defined by Section 4, in the State of Indiana, for three years immediately prior to the time of the passage of this act, shall, within ninety days thereafter, file affidavit in satisfactory proof thereof with said board, which shall make and keep a record of such persons, and shall, in consideration of the sum of five dollars, issue to him, a certificate of registration".

Section 13,817, also provides: "All persons entitled to a certificate of registration under the provisions of Section 7 (13,816 supra) shall be exempt from the provisions of Section 3 (13,812 supra)".

It seems clear that Mr. Chappelle, would be "entitled to a certificate of registration under the provisions of Section 7, if we should ignore the provision to the effect that "he shall, within ninety days thereafter, file affidavit" etc. And since the two sections referred to did not say that he shall not be entitled to a certificate unless he shall file his affidavit within ninety days, a serious question might arise as to whether, as a matter of law, he would not be entitled to a certificate upon the filing of the proper affidavit even now.

Of course this is a matter primarily for the consideration of your Board and I am merely writing to you because of the letter which we received from Mr. Chappell. It does seem to me however, that Mr. Chappell is at least morally entitled to a license as an optometrist and that it would work a grave injustice upon him if he should be ousted from his profession at his advanced age after some 40 years of practice.

It also seems to me that the law on this subject is vague enough or at least elastic enough that his case can be taken care of.

I trust that you will not accept this letter in any other spirit than that in which it is sent. I am sincerely interested in Mr. Chappell's case, if the facts which he sets forth in his letter are true, and would like to see some relief given him.

Yours very truly,

RALPH E. HANNA,

Deputy Attorney General.

REH:IJ

Evansville, Ind.
May 23, 1933.

Ralph E. Hanna,
Deputy Attorney General,
State House,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of May 20, regarding Mr. John H. Chappel of Oakland City.

Several complaints came to this office in regard to Mr. Chappel, from men who were registered Optometrists, consequently there was only one thing to do; investigate the situation. In my talk with Mr. Chappel, I assured him that I was convinced he should have been entitled to a certificate by exemption; however he really should have made an application for one back in 1907. But I told him that I certainly would lend my efforts to his support at the next board meeting and try to get a license for him.

Mr. Chappel, in his letter to you does not adhere strictly to the truth. Our talk was very friendly. I ordered him to do nothing. I suggested a few things to him for his own good, until after the next board meeting, at which time I felt I could convince the other board members that he was an exempt. Personally, I have heard of him for years and know his case myself.

In his letter to you he leads you to believe that he is only interested in Optics, and that we are putting him out of business at his age. He has a Jewelry store and watch repair shop which constitutes about 98% of his business. Another statement he makes to you that is not so, is that in 1931 Optical Schools got around our legislators and had them add an amendment that no one who did not have three years could not take an examination. You know that such a statement is preposterous. The schools had nothing to do with the increase in standards which incidentally were put into effect about eight months ago and then, merely for the benefit of the public. As you know both medicine and dentistry started with nothing and now require seven and five years respectively. As far as learning Optometry in three months, the man is rather short sighted if he really feels that way.

I feel that if Mr. Chappel must write to you he should not write you a misleading letter as he did. Here is the fly in Mr. Chappel's ointment--he has told me that he did not fit the glasses at his place but that a Mr. Smith who works for him did this work and I am sure that Mr. Smith is not entitled to a license. Also I feel that you should write Mr. Chappel advising him against allowing Mr. Smith to fit glasses after he, Mr. Chappel gets a certificate, i.e. confine the fitting of glasses to his own practice, for you certainly will bear with me that the State of Indiana does not want to issue a license to every Tom, Dick and Harry who by some hook or crook makes some one believe that he has practiced Optometry prior to 1907. This has been done, I know from some of the records available in the Secretary's files.

I will be in Indianapolis June, 12, 13 and 14. At some period during this time I would like to have an appointment with you, as I believe we have a few mutual friends.

Very truly,

J.R. Victor, Sec.,
Indiana Board of Optometry

V/W

P.S. I had advised Mr. Chappel to supply me with affidavits to the affect that he had fitted glasses prior to 1907--which he has done.

Louis Harold Jaques (1888-1983)

A father image to many an optometrist, and a popular speaker on any occasion, Louis H. Jaques, O.D., portrayed a long living example of American optometry's metamorphosis following the turn of the century. A glimpse of this portrayal is revealed in the write-up entitled "SCCO Alumnus 'Dad' Jaques Passes Away" on pages 4-5 of the Fall 1983 issue of the Southern California College of Optometry Alumniscope.

O.D., D.O., M.D.:

A 53 year combined career in optometry and ophthalmology by an American of Mexican ancestry, Reynaldo J. Carreon, Jr., O.D., D.O., M.D., is described on pages 2-3 of the Fall 1983 issue of the Southern California College of Optometry Alumniscope. As a member of a minority ethnic group he has had professionally related experiences quite different from those of the rank and file optometrist or ophthalmologist. They provide yet another view of our 20th century history.

More on L. Matthiessen and his law:

OHS member Gerald Westheimer, Professor in the Department of Physiology-Anatomy, University of California, Berkeley, answered the question, "Who was L. Matthiessen?" in the October, 1983 issue of N.O.H.S., p. 105, by referring to Gullstrand vol. 1, pp. 334-350, of Southall's English translation of Helmholtz's Physiological Optics in which Matthiessen is cited several times. The footnotes identify the above-described book* and an 1883 article entitled "Über den schiefen Durchgang unendlich dünner Strahlenbündel durch die Kristalllinse des Auges" (Concerning the oblique path of an infinitesimally thin bundle of rays through the crystalline lens of the eye) in Pflüger's Archiv für die gesamte Physiologie, vol. 32, p. 97.

Westheimer reports that he checked the latter article and adds, "Judging from the references in this article, he seems to have been a prolific contributor to this subject in the 1870's and 1880's."

From another source I learned that Matthiessen's full name was Heinrich Friedrich Ludwig Matthiessen, 1830-1908.

Gullstrand, incidentally, stated Matthiessen's law as, "the total index [of the crystalline] is just as much greater than the index at the centre of the lens as the latter is greater than that of the outside cortex," but disagreed with its validity for the human eye. Sheard stated the law in mathematical form as $N = 2n_0 - n_1$ in which N is the total index, n_0 the index of the core or center, and n_1 the index of the cortical or outer layer. (This formula was typographically mangled in the October issue of N.O.H.S.!)

The world had remote corners:

The following is one of several paragraphs under the caption of "More from the archives" in the June 1983 issue of The South African Optometrist, vol. 42, no. 2, p. 108.

Indications of the first presence of a workable lens laboratory comes from the Natal Mercury of March 10, 1894. Davidson and Lazarus from the Optical Institute of London paid regular visits to Natal and practiced at the Natal Drug Store in West Street. They informed eager readers that an establishment for making up spectacles had been set up at Markhams Building, Cape Town. The correction of astigmatism was then considered to be something of a secret remedy and Davidson and Lazarus employed special apparatus and obtained patents for doing so. It was alleged that up to that time South Africans could only obtain adequate Optometric Services by travelling overseas in one of Donald Currie's packets for treatment.

*Correction: To be described in the next issue.

The Natal Mercury was undoubtedly published in Durban, a thousand miles by boat from Cape Town, and thousands of miles from overseas England. "Donald Currie's packet" was probably a boat that carried mail, passengers, and goods regularly on a fixed route.

To burn a diamond:

Reference to the "Bregens lens" in the October NOHS, page 90, prompted an inquiry to Derek Davidson of the Ophthalmic Antiques Collectors Club who in turn responded with copy of an article by A.H. Degenhardt entitled "Transplanted in time, The Museum of the History of Science, Florence" (Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza) in the October 22, 1976, issue of The Optician, vol. 172, no. 4456, pages 16, 18, and 20, from which the following two paragraphs are lifted:

A scientific instrument of quite a different category which late in life acquired interesting British associations is the lens of Benedict Bregens made in Dresden in 1690. There is on the face of it nothing remarkable about this lens apart from its 45 cm diameter yet it kept reappearing, like a golden thread in a skein, until 1860 when it apparently came to its final resting ground in the museum. The lens has a focal length of 1.58 metres and is mounted in a gilt wooden frame on a mahogany support which carries at its other end a condensing lens and an elaborate iron place for holding objects at the focal point of the condenser. Bregens gave it to Cosimo III and from 1694 it was used by Averani and Targioni for experiments on combustion. In 1814 Sir Humphrey Davy and his young assistant Michael Faraday obtained it on a visit to Florence for experiments to determine the chemical nature of the diamond.

Faraday's report read: 'Today we made the grand experiment of burning the diamond and certainly the phenomena presented were extremely beautiful and interesting.

Bregens' lens was used to apply heat to the diamond.

Previously Mr. Degenhardt had mentioned the lens in another article about the same museum in the January 17, 1969, issue of The Optician, vol. 157, no. 4059, pp. 68-69 entitled "Florentine Museum's optical treasures." The museum is in the Palazzo Castellene, a 12th century castle.

Gradient-index lenses not so new:

Dr. Douglas Penisten sent us a copy of an interesting letter to the editor of Sky and Telescope in the July, 1976, issue, page 31, which reads as follows:

Sir:

"It was not mentioned in the News Note on page 229 of the April issue that the human eye contains a lens with a gradient index of refraction. More than a century ago, the greatest figure in the field of human vision, Hermann von Helmholtz, devoted considerable effort to this property of the eye's lens. (See pages 339 to 350 in Vol. I of his Physiological Optics, Dover, 1962.)

"Both amateur and professional astronomers should be aware that they already possess a matched pair of gradient-index lenses.

"ROY L. BISHOP
"Acadia University
"Wolfville, N. S. B0P 1X0, Canada"

Ocular massage:

Prompted by the write-up entitled "Early orthokeratology" in the October issue of the N.O.H.S., James Leeds sent me a carton of some of his own collected items along the same line. These included a "Barrett Eye Normalizer," a similar instrument bearing only the label "Natural Eyesight System," and an "Ideal Sight Restorer."

The first two consist of mechanical eye cups which when placed in contact with the closed eyelids can be made to rotate slowly and simultaneously so as to apply extorsional and intorsional force alternately on the orbital contents. The third one, roughly similar in appearance, was made to apply suctional pressure on the orbital contents, though the original rubber components are now inflexibly hard. All three provide for interocular separation adjustments. The collection included no literature for the "Natural Eyesight System" instrument, but quite a bit with the other two.

The Barrett device is explained by a 12 page pamphlet copyrighted in 1926 by Dr. Wesley M. Barrett, who identified himself as a "nationally known physician" at the Barrett Institute, 1932 W. 6th St., Los Angeles, California. A friendly referral card called a "Courtesy Complimentary Treatment" card

to refer a friend to the Barrett Institute and a letter to a prior recipient of Barrett's services indicate that Barrett had a going practice. Supplementing these was a mimeographed 8 1/2" x 11" (22 x 28 cm) stapled pamphlet of several pages entitled "The Barrett Harmonic System for Perfect Eyesight Without Glasses" by Dr. Barrett which outlines eye exercises and offers considerable rationalization of the procedures. This was accompanied by four identically titled pamphlets of 8" x 10" (20 x 25 cm) size bearing the serial identities Part one, Part two, Part three, and Part five and with similar scientifically inane contents.

A large paper sheet which when unfolded could serve on one side as a notice to be posted and on the other side as a more detailed schedule of events announced five free lectures to be given by Dr. Barrett on May 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1930, at 8:00 p.m. at Playhouse Building, 940 So. Figueroa, Los Angeles. The topic was "The New Science, BRAIN VIBRATION," and each evening included fifteen minutes of musical entertainment at 7:45 p.m., usually a violin solo and sometimes a vocal solo or an Indian dance.

Among the several items accompanying the Ideal Sight Restorer was a two page blue-ink dittoed form letter dated June 6, 1917, and individually addressed to Miss L. Bearborn, Tilton, N.H., in blue type. The letterhead is of the "Ideal Masseur Company--Successor to the Ideal Company--Toronto, Canada" and gives the New York office as 1968 Broadway. The letterhead includes an illustration of the instrument and a picture of only the ocular region of a person's face labeled "THE NORMAL EYES". Above the picture is the printed name, "W.A. Griffiths, Phm. B. Toronto Univ. Optical Specialist."

The letter purports to be in response to an inquiry, refers to an "enclosed booklet," and with considerable promotional argument, solicits her order and advance payment of ten dollars. An enclosed TRIAL ORDER BLANK is in the nature of a signed contract to use the instrument "According to directions TEN DAYS" with procedures for obtaining a refund if "the appliance is not entirely satisfactory." Also, the buyer is requested to complete a 27 question "Record Blank" with such questions as "Are your eyes large, medium or small?" "Do the eyes tire after slight use?" "Do you suffer from constipation?," etc. The order blank and questionnaire both show a stamped-in "NEW ADDRESS 870-876 Broad Street, Newark, N.J." as does also a self-addressed envelope.

The enclosed booklet referred to in the promotional letter is entitled "THE EYES, THEIR CARE, THEIR ILLS, THEIR RELIEF." Consisting of fifty pages, 19.6 x 13.3 cm, 36th edition, and dated 1904, its inside title page is captioned "THE IDEAL EYE MASSEUR, FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE IDEAL SIGHT RESTORER." Much of the text is technologically acceptable material on ordinary ocular functions and diagrams. Approximately half of the pamphlet consists of testimonials, one allegedly from ophthalmologists James and James of Kalispell, Montana.

Another similar booklet of 90 pages length in Leeds' collection is entitled, "The Ideal Sight Restorer," ninth edition 1905. It is authored by The Ideal Company, 239 Broadway, P.O. Box 660, New York, and shows the Ideal Sight Restorer patented in the U.S.A. Feb. 7, 1899 and May 16, 1899; in Great Britain, April 10, 1899; and in Canada Mar. 12, 1900, with patents pending in Germany and elsewhere. This booklet contains many more testimonials and some of the same technological material as the above-mentioned booklet, but with considerably more philosophical discussion and even some poetry about the eyes and vision.

Another small brochure, 15 pages, 15.2 x 8.8 cm, entitled "More Proofs" was published by The Ideal Company, 134 West 65th St., New York, without a date but with all of its testimonials dated in 1909 or 1910.

A tinker in lens history:

Henry Knoll was intrigued by an "eyeglass" patent by Johann F. Volle of Scranton, Mississippi, included in Obrig's "Contact Lenses" book. The application had been filed on November 12, 1900, and claimed "An eyeglass comprising a lens constructed in concave-convex shape so as to conform to the configurations of the ball of the eye when resting thereon and provided with a rearwardly-curved surrounding edge portion to engage the inner surface of the eyelids of the eye . . ." Rather than the term "contact lens," the expression "frameless eye lenses or glasses" was used to identify the clearly depicted contact lens.

Curious to know more about Mr. Volle, Dr. Knoll has done some sleuthing and found the town of Scranton, which now has another name, and, through a local historical society, has gleaned some information on Mr. Volle himself. Among other facts he learned that Mr. Volle was a tinsmith!

We can expect a more complete story from Knoll as soon as he can document a few more fascinating details.

The National Health Service Act

"Looking back at the NHS" is the title of an article by Frank M Wiseman on pages 28-29 of the Autumn & Winter 1983/84 issue of Eye to Eye, a new quarterly serial published in London. It reviews the beginnings of the National Health Service Act which came into force in Great Britain in 1948.

Half hidden treasures:

Recently James Leeds, O.D., showed me three British Optical Association Year Books which he had acquired for his collection, one for 1927, another for 1930, and another for 1938. The largest is that for 1927, over 500 pages. It includes the names of the B.O.A. Council and its officers; the objects and history of the B.O.A.; alphabetical, topographical, and various other categorical listings of B.O.A. members; a history and catalogue of the B.O.A. Library; a list of subscribers to the library fund; an eight page report of a 1926 visit to Germany by a B.O.A. delegation to survey ophthalmic optical developments; regulations for examinations by the B.O.A. and 82 pages of examination questions utilized between 1922 and 1926; articles of constitutions and by-laws; financial statements; replicas of various certificates and forms; drafts of proposed charters and legislative petitions; and a history of Clifford's Inn.

The 1930 edition of almost 500 pages is similarly composed with updated or revised directories and current drafts of reports and petitions. The 1938 edition of only about 250 pages was compiled by C.S. Flick and includes the similarly updated membership listings and considerable documentation of current B.O.A. activities but no library catalogue and fewer drafts of petitions.

When Dr. Leeds showed these to me, my first reaction was that I had seen them before, but I now realize that I had been thinking of the more recent Opticians Register, a year book published by the General Optical Council starting in 1960. Another serial of similar title is the International Optical Year Book and Diary published in London for many years, the primary feature of which is the daily pages for appointments.

Presumably a complete set of the B.O.A. Year Books may be found in the B.O.A. Library or in the possession of the British College of Ophthalmic Opticians (Optometrists), London, but apparently quite absent elsewhere. The World List of Scientific Periodicals, Fourth edition, 1965, reports it as starting in 1914, with the 1914 and 1915 issues in the British Museum, London, the 1930, 1938, and 1951 issues in the Mitchell Library, Glasgow, and the 1930 and subsequent issues in the Technical Library of the Manchester Public Libraries. The series is not listed in the Union List of Serials, in the Union List of Vision Related Serials, or in the serial holdings of ILAMO. Interestingly it is not mentioned in the B.O.A. library catalogue in any of the above-mentioned issues of the B.O.A. Year Book itself!

Surely hundreds of these Year Books must have been printed each year, but where are they? And when was the series discontinued? They are obviously a storehouse of historical information that deserve more accessible shelf space than they now seem to occupy.

Mementoes from Graubart:

Abraham L. Graubart, O.D., is a 1921 graduate of the Columbia University optometry school. Born in 1896, he practiced in Yonkers, New York, served numerous organizations in a variety of roles, published a number of articles, received several honors, and retired in about 1975. He recently had a severe stroke and is now in a home where he is considerably incapacitated, communicating only through his wife Helen, who remains at their residence at 150 Bennett Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10040. My information comes through OHS President Leeds from Herman Sager, O.D., to whom Abe Graubart gave several documents of historical interest in 1975, including the following exchange of correspondence between Graubart and Southall.

Jan 22nd 1938

Prof. James P.C. Southall
Columbia University
New York, New York

Dear Prof. Southall:-

Greetings.

The idea of a permanent optical and optometrical museum at the Columbia University School of Optometry has been on my mind for several years. At the last meeting of the C.U.O.A.A. held on Jan 7th 1938, I brought up this question and by a unanimous vote, I was made chairman of a committee to find ways and means of getting a large glass case built in the School of Optometry for the purpose of a permanent museum. Personally I will guarantee that if this case is built, it will contain an educational and interesting display of very old optical and optometrical instruments, eyeglasses, etc. I personally have several instruments that I wish to loan or give to Columbia. Some of my exhibits are over 100 yrs. old.

Several of my friends have promised to loan to Columbia for permanent use many old and valuable instruments. I am sure I can get others to loan interesting exhibits.

I believe the educational value for optometry students for a museum of this sort is great.

I shall appreciate your advice and help.

With personal regards, I am,

Respectfully,

A.L. Graubart

The following is Professor Southall's reply:

24 January 1938

Dr. A. L. Graubart
501 West 183rd St.
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Graubart

In reply to your courteous note received today, I need not tell you that I am gratified to know that the Columbia University Optometry Alumni Association has appointed you chairman of a committee for establishing some kind of an optical museum in Columbia University in connection with the Professional Courses in Optometry. Much as I should like to see this project brought to fruition and glad as I know we would be to have a really creditable exhibit of this kind, I must tell you frankly that I am at a loss to see how we could find room for it at present anywhere in the Pupin Laboratories. We ourselves are very much cramped for space on the eleventh floor and have absolutely no room for a single extra piece of furniture. Under the circumstances I am afraid a historical museum is a luxury which we cannot afford until we have more commodious quarters for instruction in optometry. Of course I shall be glad to talk with you about your plans, and I am exceedingly reluctant to seem to be throwing cold water on them.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours

James P. C. Southall

JPCS:EO

Southall's signature, incidentally, is not only in full, including periods, and highly legible, but in graceful style with a bit of flourish on the capitals.

Included also was the following typewritten report dated October 22, 1947, by Graubart in his role as president of the Optometric Foundation:

The Optometric Foundation is no doubt in its infancy, but it is a vigorous and rapidly growing baby, whose function it is to serve the professional and scientific needs of optometrists in a fashion which permits it to proceed free of political or financial entanglements. Its purpose is decidedly not to accumulate funds or money, and in a sense its basis is that it will be perennially poor in reserve funds but increasingly rich in laboratory technical and library facilities.

As I begin my third year as president of the Optometric Foundation, I should like to give a report of this organization since it was founded two years ago. Over 400 hours of instruction, valued at about \$15,000 has been contributed to the profession without charge by the members of the technical staff of the Optometrical Foundation during its two years of existence. These figures are based on the average salary payments that would be made if this work was carried on as part of a university post-graduate program. The \$15,000 only covers the value of actual instruction time, and does not include the value of the uncounted hours of research and administrative work contributed by the many optometrists who serve The Optometric Foundation.

Research-study sections in orthoptics and and contact lens work, each running 90 hours, were held in 1945-6 and 1946-7, and required an average staff of seven. The work was done in space donated by the New York Board of Education, and participants paid only \$100 for the instruction, to cover operating cost, a figure that would have been considerably higher had salaries and rent been included.

In 1946, the technical staff gave the members of the Optometric Society of New Jersey a 30-hour resume of the contact lens field. Last winter, it presented a 15-hour review of the subnormal vision field, free to contributors and at a modest \$10 fee to all others.

The Foundation is a non-profit agency, and its work is made possible by contributions, the most notable of which to date, has been the gift of \$500.00 made by the Optometric Society of New Jersey last summer. Any optometrist who is in good standing with his local society may have a voice in the government of The Foundation by donating \$10 a year. No optometrist serving The Foundation may receive remuneration for his work. The 1947-48 program, soon to be announced, will include sections in orthoptics and contact lenses, and at least two short lecture programs. Headquarters for The Foundation is at 1501 Broadway, Room 304, New York City, 18, N.Y.

H. W. Hofstetter, Editor