

NEWSLETTER
OF THE

OPTOMETRIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Volume 10

July 1979

Number 3

OHS President Knoll writes:

Two of the triumvirate are gone!

John Neill, Frank Dickinson, and Wilhelm Sohnges are well known to the contact lens fraternity as the triumvirate that developed the micro-corneal lens and founded the International Society of Contact Lens Specialists. John Neill died on December 11, 1979 at the age of 76, and Frank Dickinson died on December 25, 1978 at the age of 72.

Both were inspiring teachers; John Neill in the formal sense as a member of the Pennsylvania College of Optometry faculty, and Frank Dickinson as author and frequent speaker. Both were excellent clinicians. Both were respected and loved. The people who knew them honor them in the following:

Frank Dickinson: Ophthalmic Optician, Vol. 19, no. 2, January 20, 1979, pp1 50-51.

Optician, Vol. 177, no. 4568, January 5, 1979, p. 6.

Optician, Vol. 177, no. 4569, January 12, 1979, p. 37.

John Neill: American Optometric Association News, Vol. 18, no. 1, January 1, 1979, p. 9.

Journal of the American Optometric Association, Vol. 50, no. 3, March, 1979, p. 275.

The Deutsche Optikerzeitung carried a brief obituary notice for both men in its February 15, 1979, issue, Vol. 34, no. 2, p. 111. Dickinson was honored further in the March 15 issue, Vol. 34, no. 3, p. 106.

Polynomial expansion by Knoll

"Dear Hank:

"I don't think there is any question about the date of birth of the originator of the law of refraction. I've consulted (1) Websters unabridged (2nd Ed.) (2) Encyclopedia Britannica (1973), (3) The American Encyclopedia of Ophthalmology (1919) and (4) Meyers Kleines Konversations-Lexikon (1899) and they all give 1591 as his year of birth. When it comes to his name, things are quite different! Here's how. (1) Snell or Snellius, Willebrord; (2) Snell (van Roijen), Willebrord, commonly known as Snellius; (3) Snellius, Willebrord; (4) Snellius van Roijen, Willebrord.

OPTOMETRY LIBRARY

JUL 16 1979

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

"As you can see my half hour added two variations to your list, i.e. van Roigen and Wilebrord.

"Sincerely,

(signed 'Hank')

"Henry A. Knoll, Ph.D."

Nominations requested:

The fact that our OHS constitution and by-laws require that candidates for election to the Executive Board be nominated by three members may well deter many individuals from nominating anyone. If you personally feel that an OHS member is being overlooked as a potential candidate, simply say so in a note to Secretary-Treasurer Maria Dablement, or to any other officer. An effort will then be made to round up two more nominators. It will be helpful to know your reasons for nominating someone. By all means, if you yourself would be willing, you should not hesitate to nominate yourself. It is well to have more than one name on the ballot.

Our greatest need:

If someone, especially an affluent someone, were to confront me with the question, "What is the greatest immediate need to the development of optometry's history?", I would have a very ready response. Before I declare it, let me explain a bit.

Without a doubt the most evolutionary period in optometry's seven centuries since the invention of optical visual aids, or in the three and a half centuries since Daza de Valdez wrote his book on analytical procedure, has been the three-quarters of a century just behind us. What is more, the remarkable details of this highly effervescent era are quite accurately recorded in several serial publications which served the communication needs of the profession well. More than a gross or two of these thick and heavy volumes, collected, bound, and shelved, are to be found in remarkably good condition in several well-staffed libraries. The details include names of people, places, and dates, numbers and events, policies and opinions, illustrations and advertisements, anecdotes and vitae, - in short, a veritable wealth of material which could enable even the less experienced historian or scholar to trace a theme, a mission, a trend, or an origin with high reliability.

The catch is that most, and the best, of these historical treasures are not indexed, or are so inadequately indexed, as to be virtually un-indexed. To search a one-year volume of a single journal literally means leafing page-by-page through a thousand or more brittle pages. The information could not be more effectively buried were it placed in a crypt with only a wax candle for illumination.

To be sure, we can point our finger of blame toward the editors and publishers for neglecting to index their annual volumes adequately. I would prefer, however, to give them their due credit for having recorded the information, which otherwise could not be accessible at all. It simply has not been customary for publishers of news magazines to prepare annual indices as do publishers of scientific journals.

But therein lie the details of our history. The need, then, is to get the information indexed.

The cost? Perhaps a good many thousands of dollars. I do not know. But if an affluent inquirer, or an optometrist preparing his last will and testament, should sincerely ask me, I shall certainly exhaust every significant resource to get him or her a reliable estimate.

The actual value of such an undertaking to the profession at large would be quite immeasurable, but certainly many times over the cost. The expense of errors of repetition attributable to historical ignorance defies matching. Besides, and perhaps even more importantly, it would enrich our cultural appreciation of optometry's heritage just to know that a few key words in an information retrieval system could lay open the presently dark recesses of our history.

Thanks:

While it is not our objective to gain members merely to swell our membership list, we do wish to include any and every person, optometrist or not, who enjoys learning all that can be mustered about our professional heritage. We therefore appreciate the occasional "plud" we receive in one or another medium which has the attention of a group to which we otherwise do not have easy access. Our thanks this time to the editor of The Keystoner, a newsletter published by the Pennsylvania Optometric Association, for calling the attention of its readers to their eligibility to membership in the OHS in their April 1979 issue.

Recently added OHS members:

New members as of May 16 include the following:

W. E. Cochran, O.D.
Box 308
Kosciusko, MS 39090

Merton C. Flom, O.D., Ph.D.
School of Optometry
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Wayne E. Gordon, O.D.
125 W. Main St.
Clinton, IL 61727

Dr. Narendra Kumar, Editor
Optometry Today
P.O. Box 2812
New Delhi 11060
INDIA

Dennis M. Kuwabara, O.D.
94-748 Hikimoe St.
Maipahu, HI 96797

Floyd D. Mizener, O.D.
1043 Curtiss St.
Downers Grove, IL 60515

William C. B. Payne, Jr.
South Carolina Optometric Assn.
2730 Devine St.
Columbia, SC 29205

R. Lewis Scott, O.D.
230 West Main St.
Hartford City, IN 47348

Verne E. Petrie, O.D.
Optometric Group Inc.
Portage Lakes Med. Arts Bldg.
3515 Manchester Rd.
Akron, OH 44319

W. David Sullins, Jr., O.D.
P.O. Box 666
Athens, IN 37303

A. John Rose, O.D.
100 Parker Ct.
Chardon, OH 44024

Stanley J. Yamane, O.D.
94-748 Hikimoe St.
Waipahy, HI 96797

A "Geneva Glasses" cabinet:

A photograph of an early drawer cabinet was sent to me for identification. Approximately 60 cm wide, 30 cm deep, and 52 cm high (24" x 12" x 20"), it consists of 12 small drawers stacked in two columns of six each and one wide drawer across the top. Each drawer has two white, apparently porcelain, knobs. The top wide drawer is faced with the words GENEVA GLASSES in silver letters on blue-painted glass, and the small drawers are respectively faced with the silver numerals 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 on blue glass. Otherwise the cabinet is of handsomely finished walnut. The drawers are divided into 57 x 57 mm (2¼" x 2¼") square compartments of tongue-and-groove construction.

If you can provide any information about this cabinet, Mrs. T. R. Nusbickel, 1206 E. Glenwood Avenue, Fullerton, California 92631, would appreciate hearing from you. Also, if you will send me a copy of your letter to her I am likely to cite it in the next issue.

Subsequent to penning the above paragraphs I sent the photograph to my brother Carl, a retired watchmaker, and received the following reply: "We have a five-drawer crystal cabinet which we used for years. Every drawer is marked GENEVA. All their crystals for hunting-case watches, which had a snap cover over the thin crystal, were made overseas and had the word GENEVA on each. There is a possibility that they also made lenses for optical purposes, but I doubt it. If this were so I believe I would have seen one, or even have one from my predecessor Leon Shute."

Intromission versus extramission:

Science historians seem often to dwell a bit excessively on historical controversies. Perhaps one of the most celebrated was that of whether vision is intromissive or extramissive in nature. The question was, does the visual process consist of the transfer of rather indefinable "eidola" or "simulacra" which leave the object and infringe on the eye, or does it consist of some vague sort of visual rays or cones of visual flux which, like sensitive feelers, extend from the eye to meet the

object being viewed. Before we realized that light is something that travels and consumes measureable time doing so, rather than something which is instantaneously ubiquitous, like a thought or a hope, the question of primary directionality of the visual process was indeed a bit difficult. The fact that some animals can see in the dark was of no help either.

If this and other philosophical enigmas faced by early visual scientists are of interest to you, you will be absolutely and rewardingly fascinated by "Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler" by David C. Lindberg, University of Chicago press, 1976, 324 pages.

"One string on my fiddle":

Russell L. Stimson died on November 1, 1978. But it was only last May, 1979, that I unknowingly referred an inquirer to him to get an answer to an historical question about spectacles which perhaps only he could have answered from memory.

If I recall correctly, Mr. Stimson once told me that early in his career he had been a member of the American Optometric Association, before membership was limited to optometrists. He chose instead to go the dispensing optician route. A vigorous entrepreneur, he headed the Superior Optical Co., a corporation with 28 dispensing optical stores in Southern California. He authored several books and numerous articles, and played a strong leadership role in optical dispensing. He counted many optometric leaders among his friends and was reciprocally admired and respected by them as a technological as well as organizational contributor.

I have not yet come across an obituary or other biographical account of his life except for a very brief entry in one of his books and in the Who's Who section of the British and International Optical Year Book. In the latter, indicative of his nature, his hobbies are identified merely as "One string on my fiddle: Optics." He was both a proud and modest person, one whom I thoroughly enjoyed knowing.

Advertising around the turn of the century:

(The following is a brief observation reported by Daniel A. Talley, a member of the class of 1980 at the Indiana University School of Optometry)

Just like at present, there was very much concern surrounding the advertising of optometric goods and services around the turn of the century. This concern was prevalent enough among optometrists, then called opticians, that several articles appeared in almost every issue of the Optical Journal. The Journal dates all the way back to 1898 and even included a regular section named "Department of Advertising".²⁻⁴

The difference between the concern over advertising in 1978 versus 1902 is that advertising seemed to be accepted by all optometrists of that time. The concern of the optometrists then revolved around the type of advertising done. The Optical Journal and those optometrists who wrote articles for the journal were adamant about educating the public through

advertising as opposed to advertising prices and quality of materials. This seemed an important issue because all of the education received by the public up until this time was from traveling opticians who peddled the "magic of glasses". Optometrists were encouraged to write articles about simple refractive problems to include in their advertisements. It was also stressed that no two people can wear the same pair of glasses, and that the fitting of frames was important.

At this time, newspapers were generally thought to be the most effective form of advertising. Questions arose, such as in which paper, the morning or evening paper, it was best to advertise.

The whole family supposedly read the evening paper together, but the morning edition was believed to reach more outsiders.³

Booklets and circulars were becoming popular around the turn of the century. The "Department of Advertising" in the Optical Journal noted that good paper with good text was needed for booklets, and that the paper used for circulars for direct mailing should be of better quality than the paper for circulars intended for house to house distribution. Many optometrists were sending these booklets and circulars to other doctors, and to lawyers and teachers. The Optical Journal explained that this class of people was hardest to impress, the masses being easier to impress and easier to reach.

In 1902, a four page quarterly called Modern Optics was published. This magazine had articles written by optometrists about the science of optometry intended to educate the public. Advertisements were in the magazine sponsored by optometrists. This type of advertising at this time was said to be of the highest class ever undertaken by retail opticians.⁵

References

1. Pancoast, F.R., Optical Advertising, The Optical Journal, Vol. X, No. 2, 1902, p. 202.
2. Davis, R.A. Department of Advertising, The Optical Journal, Vol. X, No. 3, 1902, p. 354.
3. Davis, R.A., Department of Advertising, The Optical Journal, Vol. X, No. 5, 1902, p. 586.
4. Davis, R.A., Department of Advertising, The Optical Journal Vol. X, No. 6, 1902, p. 744.
5. High Class Retail Advertising, The Optical Journal, Vol. X No. 6, 1902, p. 779-780.

The 1920 Fess bill:

(The following is a letter to the Optometric Historical Society from Dwayne D. Young, a member of the class of 1980 of the Indiana University School of Optometry)

I am writing this letter about an issue that occurred in 1920, early in organized optometry's history. This event is not of interest because of its uniqueness, but rather because it is typical of many problems that optometry has faced, and, I feel safe to say, will face again. This "crisis" involved an external threat to optometry. This perceived threat was the so-called Fess physical education bill.

House bill HR 12652, Senate bill 3950, was submitted by Congressman Fess of Ohio and Senator Capper of Washington. The purpose of the bill was to upgrade and encourage the physical education of the nation's youth and to provide for the detection of physical diseases and abnormalities. The need for this was felt from the experience from World War I, when so many young men were unable to meet the armed forces physical requirements. The means of accomplishing this purpose was to be financed by appropriating from the national treasury one dollar for each child aged 6-18 years in the nation. The money was to be used for physical education instructors, instruction, and equipment, as well as for examination of the children. Thus far, the bill seemed quite noble in its purpose, with which no good citizen would disagree.

The threat came from the manner in which the bill was to be administered. The provisions of the bill were to be jointly administered in the Bureau of Education by a newly formed subdepartment of physical education along with the Surgeon General's Office of the US Public Health Service by a newly created Assistant Surgeon's Office. The federal officials were to cooperate with the state education authorities and state health boards, along with the local education authorities and local health boards in implementing the programs of the bill.

The bill, in referring to the "medical examination", specifically referred to "school nurses" and "medical examiners". This was what most upset the optometrists. The optometrists had not had good experiences with school nurses, who generally made a point of trying to send the children to oculists, the medical practitioners, and not to the optometrists. The optometrists felt sure these "medical examiners" would counsel the child and his parents so as to help themselves or their medical brethren.

It is important to get a perspective of optometry in 1920. The profession was legally quite young. It had fought hard to get legislative status, in fact the profession was still not legislatively recognized in two states and had won the milestone Baker case in Texas only the year before. The Fess bill was viewed, therefore, as an insidious attempt by the medical profession to gain a monopoly on the treatment of the nation's youth.

You may be wondering what is my source of information about this bill

and optometry's response. The source is The Optical Journal and Review of Optometry. A nearly complete collection of this journal is located in the library of the School of Optometry, Indiana University. The Optical Journal and Review of Optometry (hereafter referred to as the Journal) was a weekly publication at the time. It served as an important means of communication in the young profession.

The first mention of the Fess bill in the Journal was in the May 27, 1920 issue. The article is written by P. Scholler of Hancock, Michigan. The article is filled with inflammatory, exorbitant claims as to the effect of the bill. The editorial of the issue advises the reader to "Watch the Fess Educational Bill". The first evidence of a response by the American Optometric Association is a small item in the October 7 issue, making an urgent plea for money to help the fight against the bill. The item was written by Stanley C. Gray of Toledo, Ohio, the third vice-president of the AOA. From this issue on through the end of the year the Fess bill is the subject of at least one item, and often many, in each issue.

The responses of the optometrists to the Fess bill as appearing in the Journal were of three general types. The first was a general protest of the bill, most often made by state and local societies. The other responses were to support the bill with suitable amendments, and, lastly, to kill the bill.

Those wanting to fight to defeat the bill, among others, were Mr. Scholler and Mr. Aronsfeld, the latter well known from Texas. Many state associations and local societies, especially those from the South, supported this position. The argument to kill the bill was based on the feeling the bill violated states rights, interfered with individual rights, and meddled in the family. It was called paternalistic, unamerican, autocratic, and even Kaiser-like:

If this measure is not defeated... We will be in the hands of State Medicine, and this is far more dangerous than State Religion...

The war is over, and paternalistic, and autocratic measures should not be countenanced, whether under the heading of religion, finance, medicine, or education.¹

This group also had some extremists who grossly exaggerated the effect and purpose of the law, using the most inflated rhetoric:

My closing prayer to our chosen leaders is:
"Lead us not into temptation to compromise on the Fess or any other similar bill, but to deliver us, our children, and our children's children from the evils of a medical and any other kind of paternalistic, autocratic or bureaucratic government, and to you shall be given their thanks, praise and glory by every liberty-loving citizen of our beloved country for ever and ever. Amen!"

May the "Red, White, and Blue" continue to float and waft in heaven-born breezes as the true emblem of freedom. And now, everybody, and all together, "Kill the Fess bill."²

Those who chose the moderate response of modifying the bill so as to make it noninjurious to optometry were J. E. Eberhardt of Ohio, among other well-respected optometrists, and the legislative committee of the AOA. The official AOA response was decided at an open meeting on November 6 in Columbus, Ohio, called by Stanley Gray. Resolutions were drafted and passed stating support of the Fess bill with appropriate amendments.³ Frank L. Mulholland of Cleveland was retained as attorney to represent the association in Congress, if the bill should come up during the special session starting in December. The legislative committee was given the job of expanding the resolutions and preparing the amendments.

The reasons for amending the Fess bill, as opposed to killing it, were that its purposes were laudable, that it would most likely be enacted in one form or another eventually, and that other non-medical health professions, such as osteopathy and dentistry, could be expected to join in such an attempt. The committee's amendments proposed to make the Fess bill innocuous to optometry by putting the administration of the program entirely under the Bureau of Education, replacing the term medical examiner by physical examiner, specifying that parents have the right to decide to what practitioners to send their children, and penalizing discrimination in referrals made by the school nurses and physical examiners.

The amending approach seemed to be the better, because the sponsors of the bill were more likely to be sympathetic to the profession's concerns if support were promised with amendment than if threatened with the attempt to defeat the bill. The hopes for modifying the bill were increased by reply letters from Congressman Fess and Senator Capper to constituent optometrists that were published in the Journal.^{4,5} Both were willing to have the bill amended so as to injure no profession or group. In the December 30 issue of the Journal a draft of the entire revised Fess bill as drawn up by the AOA legislative committee and Frank Mulholland was printed.⁶ The revised bill kept the original purpose of the bill intact while incorporating the changes mentioned above.

What was the outcome? The Fess bill did not even come up before the Education Subcommittee during the short session. It was reintroduced in the next two Congresses but never got out of committee.

The value of examining this "crisis" in 1920 is that it shows optometry's reaction to an external threat -- undoubtedly like other threats that happened before 1920 and threats extending up to today. The first part of the reaction is detection followed by sounding the alarm to the rest of the profession. This is followed by a discussion of what optometry's response should be. Finally, organized optometry, the AOA, and the state and local associations, using their members and resources, formulate and implement a well thought out response. A by-product of this reaction of optometry to an external threat is the unifying of the profession.

I hope you have found this summary of the Fess bill affair to be of some interest. All the cited references are from The Optical Journal and Review of Optometry, Vol.46 (1920), 1, p. 1287; 2, pp. 1588-9; 3, pp. 1515-6; 4, p. 1731; 5, pp. 1883-4; and 6, pp. 1879-81.

Where does he find them!

Dr. James Leeds sent me three of his recent old book acquisitions to look at, just because they are something different.

One is titled COURONNE OLYMPIQUE DU TRAVAIL on the outside hard linen cover together with the Roman numeral date MCMXXXVII and the engraved gold impression of the face of the medal, La Couronne Olympique du Travail, awarded to John Hamer Sutcliffe in June 1937. The 81 page extensively assembled volume, compiled by C. S. Flick, and published by the Jount Council of Qualified Opticians, is elegantly illustrated with numerous photographs and dignified artwork. In addition to many biographical details about the recipient of the coveted crown there are chapters on the history of the International Optical league and of the Belgian and French optical associations plus numerous bits of information about contemporary institutions.

Another is a 48 page pamphlet entitled the Seventeenth Annual Report of the Manhattan Eye and Ear Hospital WITH THROAT AND NERVOUS DEPARTMENTS, 1886. Included is an etched illustration of the five-story hospital and a statement that "the hospital is designed for the indigent only, all others are excluded..." For the 12 months of the report 9,134 patients representing 34 nationalities made 54,246 visits. Types of eye affectations are classified, and names of donors of cash and articles are listed. Among the more than 100 donated articles are such gifts as 7 pairs spectacles, 1 barrel of pears, 4 turkeys, 6 flannel skirts, 2 dozen glasses of jelly, 1 bottle of Jamaica rum and sugar, and 6 washers for faucets.

The third is a hardbound 112 page volume entitled TRANSACTIONS OF AN OPTICAL CONVENTION MARKING THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST EXAMINATION IN VISUAL OPTICS BY THE WORSHIPFUL COMPANY OF SPECTACLE MAKERS, 3rd and 4th November, 1948. It happens to be a complimentary copy once owned by the late C.S. Flick, as indicated by his ink-stamped name and address and the legend on a pasted-in insert. The calibre of the meeting is well documented by the therein published lectures of Sir William Champness, A. J. Philpot, W. Swaine, A. G. Bennett, Lord Charnwood, W. D. Wright, H. C. Binstead, C. S. Flick, H. Hartridge, and W. S. Stiles.

One can wonder indeed whether we have added to the prestige of our profession during the subsequent few decades.

The meaning of the adjective "blind":

My Webster's 3rd New International unabridged dictionary identifies the derivation of the word "blind" through Middle English, Old English, Old High German, Old Norse, and Gothic. Etymologically it shares its origin with "blend", meaning to mix. Webster's lists more than a dozen variations of meaning ranging in a visual sense from the presently familiar "lacking the sense of sight" and "not having the faculty of discernment" to its more archaic connotations of "lacking in sight or brightness", "dark", "unlighted", "dull", "lacking in lustre", and "obscure".

The equivalent, and in fact identical, German word "blind", pronounced blint, is translated in The New Cassell's German Dictionary as "blind; false, sham; hidden; dim, tarnished, dull; blank; without judgment; dazzled."

It is quite tempting to suspect that the phoneme "bl" has a primordial onomatopoeic origin as well, as may be suggested by such familiar expressions as blurb, blab, blithering, and blah, all of which connote confusion, mixture, and indistinctness, not necessarily a total sensory loss.

In only an extreme sense does the adjective "blind" pertain exclusively to sightlessness or complete absence of any trace of vision. This explains why we resort to such expressions as stone-blind, totally blind, and completely blind, for if blindness meant only the absence of any trace of vision these expressions would be inherently redundant. On the contrary we even have a number of classic terms like form blind, colorblind, night blind, day blind, and snow blind, which identify categorical anomalies of visual capabilities in no sense complete losses of vision. Further we employ rather conveniently definable and readily understood phrases like legal blindness, vocational blindness, economic blindness, and educational blindness, which suggest that for a variety of purposes visual capabilities which are markedly less than typical, average, or normal are not necessarily impairments or handicaps.

In short, it is difficult to find a simpler and less unambiguous adjective or phrase which categorically and impartially includes all levels and kinds of variances of visual capability from broadly accepted norms than the millennially persistent word "blind."

Earliest accreditation?

A directory of "Reputable Optical Colleges" was published in the February 15, 1899, issue of The Optical Journal Supplement (a magazine for students), Vol. 5, No. 2, page 63. This serial publication was issued as volume 5 of The Optical Journal during the same year that The Optical Journal itself was numbered volume 6, to follow volume 4 of 1898.

Listed were 18 schools and colleges in the United States and two in Canada. The 18 in the United States are included in a previous list published in the April 1977 issue of this newsletter, pp. 19-20. The two Canadian schools were the Optical Institute of Canada with Dr. W. E. Hamill in

charge, and the Canadian Ophthalmic College, both in Toronto.

No criteria were stated, nor was the authority for determining their reputability identified. Presumably the editor of the journal assumed full responsibility for this advice.

Optometric hara-kiri:

In his REPORT FROM JAPAN submitted to the International Optometric and Optical League in March 1979, Fumio Morie, O.D., President of the Japanese Optometric Association, gives his account of certain historical events and circumstances pertaining to the present status of optometry in Japan, briefly as follows.

60 years ago Baron Shinpei Goto, then Minister for Internal Affairs in Japan, made a visit to the United States where he learned "that there were optometric doctors other than ophthalmologists." He himself was examined by an optometrist and was "amazed at the high level" of competence. He felt strongly the need to introduce this profession to Japan so he prevailed upon Dr. Morizo Ogawa to leave the States and return to Japan to open an optometry office in Tokyo. (Apparently Ogawa was born in Japan and studied optometry in the United States.)

Immediately the Japanese ophthalmological association opposed the new practice on the grounds that there existed no regulatory provisions for optometry in Japan. At first Dr. Ogawa considered returning to the U.S.A. but he finally decided to remain and go into practice in association with a medical doctor. For almost a half century, "until five years before his death," he practiced optometry in this setting serving a good many very prominent persons in education, politics, business, and the arts. His last optometric patient was the former Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda.

Dr. Morie continues, "The pince-nez worn by Baron Shinpei Goto became the symbol of Baron Goto, and the same shape of the eyeglasses of the Baron was called SHINPEI-GLASSES. It was in almost the same era that the glasses worn by the actor Harold Lloyd were called LLOYD - GLASSES." (I doubt that Japanese would, or could, wear pince-nez or that a Japanese prime minister would be titled Baron. I suspect both of these choices of words to be spurious translations.)

In 1926 Dr. Daniel Desmond, an American optometrist, came to Japan and gave a one-month course of lectures on optometry in Osaka. About 200 Japanese opticians attended his lectures and were amazed at the high level of optometry in America. They became very aware of the need to establish the profession in Japan. When Dr. Desmond left he challenged his audience to develop a viable optometry profession in Japan within 30 years. His challenge was not met.

In about 1931 Mr. Kenichi Asami enrolled in and graduated from the well-known ophthalmic optical school in Jena, Germany (now East Germany). Upon returning to Japan he started practicing optometry at Ginza, Tokyo,

where he, like Dr. Ogawa, met with bitter ophthalmological opposition forcing his closure. He then moved to Chiba, Japan, and began practicing there, where he again met with opposition. Then, "Being disappointed he lost his health and regrettably passed away." Dr. Morie adds, "At my last meeting with him, he left his words to me representing his severe bitter feelings against the Japan Ophthalmologists' Association. His words are still ringing in my ears. He must be still mortifying, under the ground, the fact that his ideas to serve people of the nation with the theory and technique which he learned was destroyed in cold blood."

The Committee on Vision:

The National Research Council Committee on Vision, an instrument of the National Academy of Sciences, was first constituted in the early part of 1944 as the Army-Navy-OSRD Vision Committee in response to national defense requirements for advice to the armed forces in areas of visual science. The OSRD was the Office of Scientific Research and Development. The Committee's recognized wartime usefulness in the coordination of basic science efforts with the needs of government agencies resulted in its continuation and development to its present status. At present the Committee on Vision is sponsored by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and five agencies: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Eye Institute (NEI), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the United States Postal Service (USPS). Each of these presently contributes a fixed sum per year through a contract administered by the Office of Naval Research (ONR). Agencies also contract with the National Academy of Sciences for specific projects under the auspices of the Committee.

The Committee's parent organization, the National Research Council (NRC), is the principal operating arm of the corporate institution, often known simply as "the Academy", that includes the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The origin of this complex was an Act of Congress in 1863 incorporating the National Academy of Sciences as a private body to concern itself with science and technology and to advise federal agencies upon request.

The National Research Council was created in 1916 to serve as the operating instrument of the Academy. It has eight major operating elements, one of which is the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences within which the Committee on Vision is a unit.

Please do not ask me to clarify this. I derived the above painstakingly from an undated 23 x 10 cm, eight page pamphlet entitled "Committee on Vision" which I received in April, 1979, as an invitee to a symposium sponsored by the Committee.

Throughout the years optometrists of academic, research, governmental, military, and clinical practice affiliation have variously been included on the Committee as members, associates, and correspondents.

About Mach:

Ernst Waldfried Joseph Wenzel Mach, 1838-1916, was born in Chirlitz, Moravia (now Czechoslovakia). His physics and metaphysics became a recurrent influence on every turn-of-the-century scholar from Vladimir Lenin to Albert Einstein. Though he was professionally a physicist, much of his work centered on the peculiarity in visual perception now known to us as Mach bands. His appointments variously included professorships in mathematics, physics, and philosophy, and for some time he served as rector of the University of Prague.

These and many more biographical tidbits are included in an article entitled "Sensation, Shock Waves, and Mach" by Steven Janke in the March, 1978, issue Number 34 of Better Teaching by Design, a newsletter published by Pasco Scientific.

Noted in passing:

Two articles of historical nature appeared in successive issues of the Journal of the American Optometric Association while I was out of the country in 1975 and were therefore overlooked by me until now. In the August issue, Vol. 46, No. 8, pages 831-834, Mr. O.R.M. Sebag-Montefiore wrote quite authoritatively on "The development of the training and qualification of the British Optician."

In the September issue, Vol. 46, No. 9, pages 900-904, five third-year students at the Southern College of Optometry, Mesdemoiselles Rosalind Overton, Billie Parks, Becky Rodgers, Donna Rodgers, and Deborah Walter, co-authored "Reginald C. Augustine: Apostle of optometry." They listed 24 references.

Augustine, 1873-1924, was the president of the American Optometric Association from 1919 to 1921. The article includes a great deal of personal information about him but, as in so many other mentions of him, his middle name is not divulged. Intriguing.

Early honorary AOA members:

Mr. Frederick Boger, Editor of the Optical Journal, appears to have been the first person to be named an honorary member of the American Association of Opticians, the founding name of the American Optometric Association. This was in 1910. That the honor was not without substance is indicated by the inclusion of a \$100 check in appreciation of his past services (the equivalent of the combined annual dues of 50 members!)

Others who were named honorary members prior to 1916 included Charles F. Prentice, Earl J. Brown, Frederick A. Woll, and Augustus A. Downing.

These bits of information were uncovered in old journals in which minutes of meetings were published. This search was undertaken in recent months under the direction of the AOA Judicial Council as part of an assignment to review all prior policy declarations of the AOA.

Other early AOA actions:

The same search uncovered some interesting expressions of optometric concern and policy prior to 1916, examples of which follow:

1903: "...that it be recommended that such steps be taken through our different boards that will disseminate this subject in all its details as we have discussed it through our optical journals and that also an effort be made to have our various optical publications carry prominently in some part of their publications a fac simile of Opto-Metrism with the definition under it and supply the electro plates to the opticians of the country at a price which will be a fair price to the opticians and yet will cover the expense of same."

1904: "The definition of 'optometrist' is 'One skilled in the practice of physiological optometry'".

1907 "Resolved, That as the legitimate practice of optometry is being gradually encroached upon by unscrupulous and incompetent persons holding fraudulent diplomas issued by disreputable correspondence schools, and the public wronged and injured by incompetent and unsatisfactory service, and the profession is injured and

"Whereas, Certain trade papers, knowingly or unknowingly, and certain disreputable persons conducting such schools, by publishing their advertisements; therefore, be it

"Resolved,...that we deplore this state of affairs, and appeal to the legislatures of the several States to enact such legislation as shall put a stop to the methods employed by disreputable schools, and that we further appeal to all optical trade papers to stop advertising such schools..."

1907: "Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the A.A.O., that its members should not use the title 'Doctor' unless they have obtained that degree from some recognized medical college".

1911: "Resolved, It is the opinion of this association that medical societies would do themselves much greater credit by encouraging Columbia and other enterprising universities in their efforts for the advancement of science rather than by belittling these efforts through giving any further publicity to the notoriously false claim that 'the practice of optometry is the practice of medicine.'"

1915: "Whereas, Many optical publications contain advertisements

quoting specific prices which may cause unnecessary annoyance to the optometrist in relation to his patrons;

"Resolved, That it is hereby recommended that this practice be discontinued."

Ophthalmic opticians memorialized:

The Harry Marton Library has been created in the Department of Ophthalmic Optics of the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST).

The J. Stephen Dawson Memorial Awards have been established at the London Refraction Hospital.

Sutcliffe and the BOA museum:

Margaret Mitchell, the first honorary member of the Optometric Historical Society, has authored a report in a series intitlled "The BOA Museum: its origin and development." in the August 29, 1975, issue of the Optician, Vol. 170, number 4397, pages 4, 6, and 7. She takes none of the credit for her own career-long years of library and museum service to the BOA (British Optical Association). Instead, she attributes the splendid growth of the institution largely to the persistent efforts and drive of J. H. Sutcliffe, founder of the collection.

Then in a subsequent issue of the same volume, no. 4399, September 12, pages 33-34, she describes in Part II some of the museum's high-lighted acquisitions. Illustrated is the carved statuette of St. Odila from 15th century Germany, who was born blind in 650 and became the patron saint who gave protection against eye disease, and whose name-sake was the Roman Catholic optical guild of St. Odila.

Part III appears in the September 26 issue, no. 4401, pages 33 and 35, dealing especially with some amusing curios such as, for example, the "jealousy" spyglass, miniature spectacles for dolls, and a spectacle frame hewn out of toothbrush handles by an entomologist in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp.

Einstein on light:

This being the centennial year of Albert Einstein's birth, articles about him have been appearing in a great variety of science journals. Perhaps the one closest to optometric interest is that which appeared in the Winter 1979 issue of Optics News, Vol. 5, No. 1, pages 24-39, by Emil Wolf. The title is "Einstein's Researches on the Nature of Light." Dr. Wolf includes theories, researches, and photographs of numerous other opticians as well, in order to fit Einstein's role into proper perspective.

More on G. H. Giles

"The George Giles story. Outline of a remarkable career" by Claude Lyons appears in the October 4, 1975, issue of the Ophthalmic Optician, Vol. 15, no. 19, pages 859-863, 868-870, and 874-875. Supplementary reminiscient comments by six other close associates of Giles follow on pages 875-880. Candid photographs of George in action, recollections of some of his quips and philosophical gems, and personal accounts of many of his accomplishments make this a touching review of his life only 10 years after his untimely death.

The thousand or more American optometrists who became acquainted with Mr. Giles during his whirlwind tour of American optometry schools and colleges in 1954 would find much nostalgia in this article.

Local society history:

The Midland Optical Society, representing the Ophthalmic Opticians of the central counties of England, The Midlands, mainly Birmingham and vicinity, was formed in the first decade of this century. The various society secretaries over the years recorded and maintained detailed information in the minutes book. Roberts S. Green has reviewed these minutes in an article entitled "Midland Optics, with special reference to Birmingham and district" in the August 9, 1975, issue of Ophthalmic Optician, vol. 15, no. 16, pp. 733-734.

A special historical value of local society minutes is their inclusion of details and issues very unlikely to be considered in the larger policy-making organizations. Such information, often very personalized and individualized, can permit greater understanding of the events and actions of the time in the same way that we can appreciate a tasty dish better if we know its ingredients.

History of color description:

"...philologists have found out that, in their early stages of development, all languages have a dearth of color names," said David L. MacAdam in his talk given in response to receiving the Frederic Ives Medal from the Optical Society of America in 1974. He also suggested that the first color name occurs in Chapter 25 of Genesis, where Esau is reported to have been born all red and hairy, and that blue, purple, and scarlet are first mentioned in Exodus 26:30. (In my Jerusalem Bible, edited by Alexander Jones, purple, violet, red, and crimson are the colors mentioned in the cited passages.)

MacAdam's paper then takes us through the use of color terms and formulations by Homer, Aristotle, et al, right up to Herbert Ives, son of Frederic and donor of the medal, who also did significant color research in the thirties. The talk was published in the May, 1975, issue of the Journal of the Optical Society of America, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 483-493, under the title of "Color essays."

Public health optometry in Australia:

Australian optometrists became officially concerned with the possible influence of national health insurance legislation on their profession more than 50 years ago. Brian Layland describes developments, controversies, and manifestations of optometric interest during the half century in a detailed article entitled "Optometry and national health" in the November 1975 issue of the Australian Journal of Optometry, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 402-408.

Two organizations are mentioned frequently, one the AOA, which is of course the Australian Optometrical Association, and the other the BMA, obviously a medical association, but what does the "B" stand for?

About Turville:

Professor G. V. Ball of the University of Aston, Birmingham, reminisces about the late Mr. Turville in "A. E. Turville remembered" in the July 11, 1975, issue of The Optician, Vol. 170, No. 4390, pages 31-32. He recalls their cooperation in the '30s to provide vision screening of freshmen at the university and their many discussions of the use of the "infinity balance" and other ingenious techniques as parts of the test procedure. Eleven supporting references are listed.

Tribute to Feinbloom:

"William Feinbloom: pioneer in plastic contacts" is a well earned accolade by Henry Knoll in the August 1977 issue of Contact Lens Forum, Vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 29 and 31-32. Evaluations of the role Feinbloom was playing by such early contemporaries as the late Carel Koch and James P. C. Southall are included. Much of his personal character is revealed by this rather brief account.

A toast to dear old Maine:

If my memory is correct it was Harry Pine who said that when optometry is injured in Maine it bleeds in California. Well, the Maine Optometric Association has survived its injuries quite well, for in 1976 it celebrated its 75th anniversary. It was on the last day of 1900, Dec. 31, that a warrant was issued to a Justice of the Peace whereby a meeting could be called for the purpose of organizing the Maine Association of Opticians early in 1901. Ten years later, on March 22, 1911, the organization renamed itself the Maine Association of Optometrists. It assumed its present name on January 14, 1946.

These and other details are reported anonymously as the "History of the Maine Optometric Association" in the January 1976 issue of the New England Journal of Optometry, Vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 12-13.

A brief visual science chronology:

A different way to make a point is undertaken by R. E. Tina of Vienna in an article entitled "Zeittafel der Sehlehre" (A chronology of visual science) in the December 10, 1978 issue, of Neues Optikerjournal, Vol. 20, No. 12, pages 17-19 & 21. He lists in their order of occurrence 44 inventions, developments, discoveries, and contributions in visual science beginning with Helmholtz's ophthalmoscope in 1850 and concluding with Meynert's study of the morphology of the visual cortex in 1868. Each of the 44 entries is summarized in a sentence or a paragraph or so, as if to assume that the reader is already reasonably familiar with the scientific fact but might not know its place on a time scale. The effect is moderately startling, almost suggesting that the invention of the ophthalmoscope itself was the conception of an explosive era in visual science.

Wells a rebel? Yes and no:

At the age of 18, in 1775, William Charles Wells sailed from South Carolina, his place of birth, to England, because he would not subscribe to the colonial movement that led to the War of Independence. Yet his whole personal life seemed to be a series of passionate and violent events fitting his impatient and impetuous nature. He acquired a medical education, but he is chiefly remembered for his 1792 publication of his Essay on Vision.

Many personal details about the man are fascinatingly described by Simon Behrman in an article entitled, "William Charles Wells, 1757-1817" in the February 1976 issue of the British Journal of Ophthalmology, Vol. 60, No. 2, pages 79-83.

Gonioscopy and library tracer elements:

Starting with the etymology of the word gonioscopy and the mention of two clinical events that rendered it "an everyday office examination", A. Dellaporta, M.D., then credits Alexios Trantas with the first examination of the angle of the anterior chamber in the living eye in 1899 in an article entitled "Historical Notes on Gonioscopy" in the September-October, 1975, issue of Survey of Ophthalmology, Vol. 20, No. 2, pages 137-149. The article is supported by 118 references, numerous illustrations, and interesting biographical commentary.

An interesting sidelight to the author's search for biographical clues was his tracing of the bibliophilic adventures of one of his subjects, Dr. Otto Barkan, through the cards attached to the inside back covers of Lane Stanford Library books on which were the dates and signatures of the persons who had checked them out!

"Father of American Ophthalmology":

Such is the accolade given George Frick, M.D., 1793-1870, who wrote the

book entitled "A Treatise on the Disease of the Eye; including the doctrines and practice of the most Eminent Modern Surgeons, and particularly those of Professor Beer," published in Baltimore in 1823.

The book is reviewed by James S. Kelley, M.D. in the January-February 1975 issue of Survey of Ophthalmology, Vol. 19, No. 4, pages 255-260, under the title "A Treatise on the Diseases of the Eye: First American Ophthalmic Textbook (1823)"

Of Drs. Hermann and Arnold Knapp:

"The Hermann Knapp Memorial Eye Hospital" is the title of an article by Gordon M. Bruce, M.D., in the January-February 1975 issue of Survey of Ophthalmology, Vol. 19, No. 4, pages 240-247. Dr. Herman Knapp died in 1907 and was succeeded by his son Arnold as Director of the New York Ophthalmic and Aural Institute which later was renamed The Hermann Knapp Memorial Eye Hospital. Much of the article is a delightfully reminiscent account of the related experiences of the author and of other persons who knew either or both of the Knapps.

The Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers:

This is the title of an historical article by Colin J. Eldridge in the April 1979 issue of the Journal of the American Optometric Association, Vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 481-483 and 485-487.

The trio from Jena:

"Wie kamder 'Dreiklang Zeiss-Abbe-Schott' in Jena zustande?" (How the Zeiss-Abbe-Schott triad of Jena came about) is the title of an article by an anonymous colleague in East Germany which appeared in Neues Optikerjournal, Vol. 20, No. 11, November 10, 1978, pages 33, 35 and 36. It consists primarily of illustrated biographical accounts of Dr. h. c. Carl Zeiss, Ernst Abbe, and Dr. Otto Schott.

90 years of tonometry:

Oftal'mologicheskii Zhurnal has an article in Russian by M.E. Vurgaft on (translated) the 90-year usage of applanation tonometry after Maklakov, Vol. 29, no. 8, 1974, pp. 620-622. The reference is listed by the Visual Science Information Center, 2155 Webster, San Francisco, California 94115.

If an OHS member, or any other volunteer, can read Russian and give even a brief review of this article, the rest of us will appreciate it indeed.

H. W. Hofstetter, Editor