

NEWSLETTER
OF THE
OPTOMETRIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY
(243 North Lindbergh Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63141, U.S.A.)

Optometry Library
Vertical File

Vol. 15

July 1984

Number 3

Annual call for nominations:

The board member whose five-year term will expire at the end of this calendar year is Henry A. Knoll. The other members and the expiration years of their five year terms are Maria Dablemont, 1985; Jerome J. Abrams, 1986; James P. Leeds, 1987; and Patricia Carlson, 1988.

Nominations, or renominations, for the 1985-89 term are hereby requested for placement on the ballot in October. They may be submitted to Henry Hofstetter, 2615 Windermere Woods Drive, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, U.S.A.

By all means do not hesitate to include yourself as a candidate if such responsibility interests you. Remember, self-nominated volunteers founded the O.H.S., and unpaid volunteers have kept it going.

Ordinarily, merely the name of the person you are nominating will suffice, especially if he or she is already well known to O.H.S. members, but if you feel that a brief "pitch" should be made in your nominee's behalf it will be most favorably considered for inclusion with the October issue of N.O.H.S.

Our co-editor returns:

Douglas K. Penisten, O.D., who a few years ago shared the duties of assembling and editing the N.O.H.S., is back in Indiana after a sojourn of teaching and administration in the optometry program at the University of the North, South Africa. With a part-time teaching appointment at Indiana University he is pursuing another objective, the Ph.D. degree. He really has not yet had time to organize his new activities sufficiently to allow us to get together and discuss how we will divide our activities in behalf of this newsletter, but we will. Indicative of his enthusiasm and desire to volunteer his assistance is the fact that, upon his very recent arrival, he hastened to put together three paragraphs about Thomas Edison to include in this issue, identifiable in this instance by the subscript "D.K.P."

Having an aversion for the evasive use, and abuse, of the "editorial we," I have consistently, I hope, used the first person singular to identify every point of view which originated with me. Further, since my name usually has appeared alone at the close of this newsletter, the reader has had to presume, quite correctly, that I have exercised essentially sole responsibility for assembling

the contents. That holds for this issue, too. In future issues, however, I hope that Doug and I can share and/or alternate the responsibility. At the same time I hope we can work out a simple technique whereby we can, in occasionally appropriate instances, identify our individually initiated contributions and express our personal comments in first person singular form.

Such are the privileges of volunteer workers. Let the critic beware.

From a student's notebook:

An occasional discomfort of a professor in his later years is the fondly recited memory of a former student as to something the professor once said in a lecture. So often it is something that the former student merely wanted to believe had been said by the professor. A bit helplessly the old professor can only insist in astonishment that he cannot believe he ever said that, a response which suggests that he may be suffering from Alzheimer's disease.

On at least two recalled occasions, however, I have prevailed on a former student to prove his citation by showing me where he recorded my alleged pronouncement in his class notes. In each instance he discovered that his notes contradicted his memory.

So, it was not without some special interest that I recently came across a loose-leaf bound set of class notes taken by V.F. Kring, O.D., during his attendance at Northern Illinois College of Optometry in October 1935.

In several issues of the Blue Book of Optometrists Dr. Kring listed himself as a 1923 recipient of a Ph.G. degree from the Ohio Northern University College of Pharmacy, a 1934 alumnus of the North Pacific College of Optometry, a 1936 graduate of the Northern Illinois College of Optometry, a 1943 recipient of the B.S. degree, and a 1944 recipient of the M.D. degree, both of the last two from the McCormick Medical College. He practiced in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and held continuous membership in his local, state, and national associations, his last Blue Book listing being in the 1962 edition. His note book and other personal effects had been inherited and set aside in the Indiana University School of Optometry library for an unknown number of years awaiting an administrative decision as to their assignment or disposal.

His notes, in very legible longhand, 104 20 x 26 cm sheets, usually written on both sides, were taken during a fall semester from lecturers identified as Keef, Shepard, Atkinson, Heather, and Alf Johnson for courses either labeled or obviously identifiable as Ethics, Myology, Bacteriology, clinical optometric procedure, and ophthalmic dispensing, respectively.

Now for the pièces de résistance, selected very unfairly, no doubt, by me to satisfy nothing but my amusement and fascination, to represent neither the tones of the lectures nor the student's note-taking capabilities.

Attributed to Keef: "Passion is the Psychological motion induced by a feeling of love or hatred." "The Optometrist himself must possess five cardinal Virtues: 1. Honesty 2. Sincerity 3. Ability 4. Will Power 5. Decency" "Explain Astigmatism, don't use it as an open sesame to high prices."

Attributed to Shepard: "A child's best vision is when he or she is 15 years of age." "A myope judges distance of an object by sharpness of focus." "Prism should never be prescribed without exercise."

Attributed to Atkinson: "Pneumonia never lasts long enough to immunize the person." "Two men, one an Austrian and the other Oliver Wendell Holmes, noticed the germ of puerperal fever and found that students and hospital interns were carrying this germ from one patient to another." "The human and the monkey are the only animals susceptible to syphilis."

Attributed to Heather is a series of 70 numbered questions, such as: "What is the significance of the family history?" "What is meant by physiologic exophoria and its indication?" "How may you examine the media without an ophthalmoscope?"

Attributed to Johnson: "You can almost measure temple length by P.D." "Univis caters to oculists. Do not use them. They are not as good as Panoptics." "The main thing in adjusting an oxford is to get the right tension on the nose."

Dr. Kring's notebook is being sent to the International Library, Archives, and Museum of Optometry for the permanent archives. The full name of three of his five instructors are quite certainly Carl F. Shepard, O.D., Thomas George Atkinson, M.D., and W. Jerome Heather, O.D. The names Keef and Alf Johnson are not familiar to me.

Medical adviser to a pope:

The role of an eye physician, Professor Riccardo Galeazzi-Lisi, as the personal general physician of Eugenio Pacelli is described in "La Popessa," a 1983 book by Paul I. Murphy, published by Warner Books, New York. Pacelli served as Pope Pius XII from 1936 to 1958, as the Vatican Secretary of State from 1930-1936, and as the official in charge of the Vatican's foreign office for many years earlier. The book is identified as "The Controversial Biography of Sister Pascalina [nee Josefine Lehnart], the Most Powerful Woman in Vatican History." She had devoted virtually all of her long career as a nun in the highly personal and intimate service of Father Pacelli until his death as Pope Pius XII.

In the outspoken opinion of the nun Dr. Galeazzi "was merely an eye-specialist and nothing more." She reported that, early in his career in the Vatican, the later to become Pontiff "had been out walking and saw a gaudy sign with a huge painted eye dangling from a building, advertising Galeazzi-Lisi's services, and was reminded that he needed new glasses and marched up the stairs to the doctor's offices." Further, she reported that "Dr. Galeazzi-Lisi was overwhelmed by his important new patient; and when his medical training and experience failed, his flattery and fast talk succeeded." Pius would send for Galeazzi-Lisi for whatever health problem he had. He is quoted as saying, "I know only one doctor in Rome. Send for Galeazzi."

Upon Pius's death Galeazzi insisted on official Vatican permission to proceed with an untried embalming procedure which, he argued, was the Pope's explicit wish. It turned out to be a colossal blunder. He also is credited with attesting to the credibility of Pius's claim to have been visited by Jesus Christ. Finally, quite without explanation, the author reports that eventually Dr. Galeazzi-Lisi was expelled from the Italian medical profession and censured by the Church.

Four friendly new members:

OHS member Andrew F. Fischer, O.D., himself a long time contributor to optometry's history, quintupled his 1984 dues payment to include gift memberships to four of his Pennsylvania friends, Drs. Bernard Adler, Martin Hafter, Bernard Kushner, and Arnold Mazer.

Mindful of chain-letter theory, one can calculate that if every OHS member did the same, within the time it would take for three successive mail deliveries our membership would increase to 17,129!

History knows no bounds:

Dr. Selwyn Super, Dean of the newly established School of Optometry at Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg, South Africa, recently paid a visit to the International Library, Archives, and Museum of Optometry, Inc. (ILAMO). While there he paid his current OHS membership dues, having been a member since 1972. At the same time he made a gift of OHS membership to his friend Professor Charles B. Margach, O.D. at the Southern California College of Optometry, Fullerton, California.

This may well be the most remotely extended gift in optometric history!

Colonel Sheridan deceased:

Colonel John W. Sheridan, O.D., a 1935 graduate of The Ohio State University School of Optometry, was the first to receive a commission as an optometrist in the Army Medical Service Corps following enactment of legislation in which optometry was included for commissioning. He became the first chief of the Optometry Section of the Corps. Many of us knew him as "Jack," but especially as the living symbol of optometry's success in perhaps the profession's biggest single political hurdle. He wore his badge humbly and was later granted the Apollo Award by the American Optometric Association.

His death on May 2, 1984, at the age of 73 has closed another vital chapter of personal dedication in optometry's history.

The "roaring twenties":

The strong undercurrents of philosophical controversies of another era are most difficult to perceive from either the ultimately compromised evolvements or from the contemporary columns of editorially tempered journals. The heated outbursts that expose the intensity of feelings are quite properly put out of memory as soon as possible, and above all they are kindly eliminated from the permanent record.

Unfortunately such human courtesy handicaps the eventual historian who tries to grasp the significance of events that may relate to an otherwise unfathomable trend or absence of trend. So he is pleased with every bit of uncensored discovery that may help to piece together the history of a critical period.

Such was the period in the 1920's in the United States when all of the states had accomplished the enactment of laws to regulate the practice of optometry. The newly appointed state boards were required to formulate the educational requirements to be met by optometry school graduates applying for licensure. For the first time, existing optometry schools were having to meet externally decided standards.

Among the old papers recently disposed of by the Indiana State Optometry Board was a mimeographed document on the letterhead of the North Carolina State Board of Examiners in Optometry, Office of the Secretary, Lumberton, N.C. entitled "A REPLY TO DR. W.B. NEEDLES BY DR. W.W. PARKER, SECRETARY, NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN OPTOMETRY." It may be surmised that copies were distributed to many or all state board secretaries late in 1925. The article opened with the following parenthetical paragraph:

(The Optometric Weekly refused to publish this reply, giving as their excuse that it was too personal. However, in view of Dr. Needle's unjust criticism and insinuations, the writer is of the opinion that the phraseology of his reply is justified, and takes this means of disseminating his view, to which the profession is entitled.)

Dr. Walker's paper refers to a lengthy article by Dr. W.B. Needles, President, Needles Institute of Optometry and Northern Illinois College, in the August 27, 1925, issue of The Optometric Weekly and The Optometrist & Optician, pp. 1083-1087. The polemic tone of Dr. Needles' article may be sensed from a few selected statements, as follow:

"We are dying out because we are not recruiting man power at half the rate we are losing it." "The one thing that has stopped the increase in optometrists is obviously the restraining influence of state laws." "We procured our laws as a bulwark against being driven out of business." "Protection was our prime motive." "Optometry can never occupy a similar position to dentistry. The dentist has no competitors; no medical man envies him or desires any part of his practice." "Scores of general [medical] practitioners, dissatisfied with routine work, have taken up optometry as an easy road to specialization." "How rigid can optometry make its requirements and continue to grow?" "Only the educators know how impossible it is to fill a course of two thousand hours without teaching extraneous subjects or 'padding'." "Who are the men who prescribe these standards? They are chosen chiefly from the ranks of the state board examiners. None of them are school men." "The courses now being taught at Columbia and Ohio State, and possibly California, are well organized, but in procuring for these courses teachers who are acceptable to the university and who know something of optometry, they have about exhausted the supply." "The optometrist of today finds favor with the public largely because of the expert optical service which he can give." "If we drift along at our present rate for another ten years our national conventions will look like a corporal's guard."

Equally articulate was Dr. Walker's unpublished reply, as follows:

In The Optometric Weekly of Aug. 27th there appears a contribution by Dr. W.B. Needles under the caption "Must Optometry by Stifled?" It would be well for each subscriber to The Weekly to reread this article, for it is a masterpiece of inconsistency and contradiction of the author's former position. When one takes into consideration the great number of lectures Dr. Needles has delivered over the country, heralding professional optometry, his statements become ridiculously amusing.

The writer does not wish to enter into any controversy over the article in question, and would not make this reply except for the fact that the author has gone so far in his insinuations as to apparently think his remarks will be accepted without question, and if so, his ideas will prove a panacea for all of our optometric ills. Of course, the main reason for the Doctor's lengthy article was to "swat" the naughty fly that dared to sit on his prominent "knows."

In contradistinction to the gentlemen referred to, the writer desires it to be known at the outset, that he stands strictly for professional optometry and not the shopkeeping stuff commended in his "ideal" the New York City "optician." The style in which an optometrist conducts his practice unquestionably shows "where his heart is" and you do not have to converse with him to know it. The fellow with a shop as we generally find him, is a merchant thinking in terms of sales rather than service. He may pretend otherwise, but investigate if you please his professional training and you will find little to his credit. The ring of the cash register has a far sweeter sound than ever did the voice of our eminent teachers. The pity of it, he is so blinded in the lack of self-preparation he does not appreciate that knowledge pays or is capable of raising him to a higher plane of usefulness. The writer is convinced, after having passed through many stages of our optometrical development, that the shop keeping idea Dr. Needles would indicate, is one of the most pernicious evils with which we have to contend. It is preposterous to expect one to see and appreciate the wonderful organ of vision that it is, thinking in terms of optical merchandising. Do we need laws to regulate such a grab-dollar proposition? Probably so, to prevent such deficient practice.

If we can not make a profession of optometry by compelling high school graduation and two years or eighteen months of optometric subjects, then let's be honest enough with ourselves to quit talking professionalism, and publishing pages of high sounding Greek fraternity news, and see who can outrival the other fellow in the business of hornrims, gazing globes and all the other junk that goes to supply an "ideal" spectacle shop. Anyone who has attained to real professionalism along studious and ethical lines knows that two years should be the minimum for the present, and that we should be scarcely worthy of statutory regulation with less preparation. Give our students this amount of intensive training in optometry and ophthalmology, which of course includes such essential subjects as ocular hygiene, clinical pathology and diagnosis, and the public will be quick to recognize their superior ability.

Dr. Needles' scare-crow, the oculist, is only further evidence of the false doctrine he would have us accept without question. Does he mean that we should confine our professional training and practices to trying to ape the oculist in his usual lack of knowledge of optometry? How absurd! How would we ever hope to establish the respectable profession on a basis with men who do not know even the fundamental science of optometry? We shall establish optometry by excelling and not by imitating him. Certainly, this would be the only honest way, and should we fail in this, we shall still have the "ancient opticianry" as a solace.

Now, the writer is of the opinion that the whole trouble with Dr. Needles is, he has allowed himself to become a little peevish because the North Carolina Board deemed it to the best interest of the profession to rule out his two schools. Naturally, when you interfere with a man's "commercial" aspirations, you hit his pocketbook and he at once becomes excited, and in this state of mind he makes all sorts of inconsistent statements. Long before the Doctor burst forth into print, he wrote to the chairman of our Board expressing his displeasure at the way his schools had been "discriminated" against, and insinuated that the secretary was a most unreasonable person for having brought this about. To this the writer desires to say that it does not matter who introduced the idea--the ruling was carried unanimously. This Board, since its reorganization some two years ago, has not acted on the advice of anyone, as we have also been accused, but instead, have been governed entirely by our own judgment based on knowledge gained from candidates from the various schools, as well as the Board members' attendance at different schools. Neither have we assumed any "holier than thou" attitude, except toward those schools which we refused to recognize. We are of the opinion that these should have had the "whip cracked" over them, because they failed to keep abreast of the profession. We were actuated by something higher than so much per student. We thought it both reasonable and fair that unless these schools complied more closely with the syllabus their heads subscribed to at St. Louis in 1922, they should go, and the sooner the better.

The writer has before him a copy of this syllabus containing a picture of Dr. Needles seated proudly at the council table. He indorsed this syllabus and thereby indicated to the world that he would adopt it as the standard for his schools. He failed to abide by his agreement, and now he slurs at the state board members of the country because the North Carolina Board has had the courage and initiative to refuse his students. He insinuates that we are all a bunch of ignoramuses, and incapable of sane judgment, because we "do not know the school business." The members of this Board are willing to admit that they are not school teachers, but we have had association with

a goodly number who were, together with some who were not, and from these together with the knowledge before mentioned, have learned pretty well "who is who" in the "teaching business."

Then, too, this "inadequately informed" secretary suspects that the learned Doctor has never had, and never will avail himself of the comprehensive training in ophthalmology that has been his privilege. He has not contented himself with the parrot-like information gleaned from text-books alone, as taught mostly at the Needles schools, but instead has spared no time and money in acquiring knowledge as taught in the laboratories and clinics of the best optometrical and post-graduate medical schools. The writer holds certificates, by attendance, from four different schools of optometry and one in eye, ear, nose and throat surgery from a leading post-graduate medical school; having studied in one other of America's largest eye, ear, nose and throat clinics. Not to be a "near medical man" either, but to learn the essentials of an optometrical practice.

In conclusion, to the prospective student or practitioner who would ask the question: Does this amount of study pay? Most assuredly it does. The fellow who would say that it does not is either untruthful, impractical, or has not had sufficient of this preparation to realize its value.

We must remind ourselves that these brief and isolated excerpts from the certainly extensive expository contributions of both Drs. Walker and Needles should not label either as wrong or right. These excerpts serve merely to illustrate the intensity of the controversy and the difficulty of analysis of the issues without our present knowledge of the outcome.

From the fathomless forties:

Among discarded papers from the Indiana State Board of Examiners in Optometry is a typewritten article by G.F. Kintner, O.D., Wabash, Indiana, entitled THE MAIN ROAD OR THE BACK ROADS. It appears to have been written circa 1944 and probably was never published. The paper points up one of the critical issues of its era and expresses articulately the frustrations of those who recognized the needs.

Dr. Kintner is presently in the nursing home of a retirement community in Lacey, Washington. He was born in Lima, Ohio, August 3, 1904, the eldest of eight, all of whom chose careers in the health care field, two in optometry, one in dietetics, one in dentistry, and four in medicine. When Galen was five the family moved to North Manchester, Indiana, where his father took a position as Professor of Biology at Manchester College. Galen attended Manchester College, later the University of Akron while working for the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.,

and finally enrolled at the Northern Illinois College of Optometry. He taught there for two years before going into private practice in Wabash, Indiana. In 1949 he married Peg, who kindly provided this information. Shortly thereafter they moved to Lynden, Washington, where Galen practiced until his retirement in 1973. He has given permission to include his circa 1944 paper here, as follows:

Whether we like them or not, we have nine schools turning out graduates in optometry. Three of them are schools associated with recognized educational institutions. We have educational institutions that grade all the way from plain rackets right up to the highest type of schools. For instance, one school has only one man on its permanent faculty with a recognized degree and that in veterinary medicine.

There is no need for our sticking our heads in the sand and saying that agencies outside the profession know nothing of our school situation. I have been told: "Until you get your schools in shape, you can never be recognized." Officials in Washington know more about our schools than you and I do and upon that knowledge, they deny optometry the recognition it desires. I have been told that it was not the commercial aspects of optometry that was preventing its recognition for: "We (Medicine and Optometry) have scoundrels and we will always have them; but OPTOMETRY MUST CLEAN UP ITS SCHOOLS, IF IT IS TO SURVIVE."

For as long as I have been in the profession, every effort to raise the level of our educational attainments has been stymied by some of the following deterrents:

1. Bogey of turning optometrists into medical technicians. This is just plain silly, for medicine could not cancel the laws governing optometry in these forty eight states even if it wanted to. The fact that dentists and pharmacists take their first two years in the same classes as medical students did not change them over night into medical technicians. If optometry does not clean its educational house, medicine can and will educate its own refracting technicians, for it has already done it in the Army and Navy.
2. Optometry must have private schools. This statement is based upon the misconception that private schools can be better controlled than university schools. This is largely the result of friendships, political log-rolling, emotional appeal and practice of all of the wiles of the smart salesmen. The fact that there still flourishes a private school which turns out graduates in twelve to fifteen months and advertises

that it does it in eighteen, is proof that the profession has no control of its private schools.

This bogey is largely of our own making and is due to the fact that we fear the domination of medical education in the universities with which our schools may affiliate. Or there is the alternate fear that certain types of education would be denied optometry students by the medical educators.

It should be clear to everyone that recognition of optometry and participation and assistance in its educational program by educators of medicine must be preceded by a DRASTIC and COMPLETE overhauling of its schools. No other alternative procedure is possible.

3. The philosophy that somehow we can muddle through. For five years now, with all the latitude they were given, the schools, themselves, have been unable to come to any common standard for entrance requirements, curriculum, standards for graduation, etc., etc. It is patent that some strong force must induce the schools to do the will of the profession in order to meet its needs. Dr. Sheard, who has as good a birds-eye-view of the profession as any man in it, says: "Optometry's dispensation to clean up its school is fast running out." We are definitely faced with the need for courageous action.

Every recognized authority on professional education tells us that the proprietary, commercial, private (or whatever you want to call it) school must quit or become affiliated with a recognized institution and that as soon as practical. The only fact that we need to consider to assure ourselves of that is to compare the present status of private and university schools. Picture the work that is being done at California by Morgan and Stoddard against the low estate that was mentioned previously. How the change to university affiliation can be done should be the only matter for discussion in the profession. This paper is not intended to elaborate on the changeover.

When I was teaching at an optometry school, we were inspected and reinspected by the Council and by the I.B.B. (International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry) until the inspectors were almost underfoot. The result (in spite of claims to the contrary) were exactly nil. I cannot believe some sort of divine power will change the picture with the present Council on Education. The I.B.B. has largely been shorn of its accrediting power and rightly so. However, the Council on Education must, with all the authoritative assistance it can muster, initiate the steps to be taken. There is only one power that can finally clean up our educational mess, and that is:

THE PITILESS LIGHT OF PUBLICITY CONCERNING THE STATUS OF SCHOOLS TEACHING OPTOMETRY.

Those that can stand up under it will survive. Those that can not survive the light of day will need to make changes or quit.

We can learn from medicine's experience which exactly paralleled ours. We can call in some agency such as the Carnegie Foundation who will be listened to with respect, give them carte blanc to investigate our educational system--undergraduate and graduate--and then give their report the widest publicity. I understand that it will cost the profession in the neighborhood of \$3500 to \$5000 to accomplish this. Some people are going to be hurt (some of them are my very good friends) but the profession is bigger than any individual or group of individuals within it. If we do not recognize that fact, then we will have no profession. The Association must courageously face the fact that such action may make temporary enemies. It may be threatened with litigation as the A.M.A. was. The gains it will make in friends, in raising itself above the cults into the fellowship or professions will out-weigh all of its temporary losses.

This subject is one that is very important to me and all the other ordinary, fingerling optometrists. We have a longer way to go in our profession than the majority of optometrists and we want to travel that road in the company of and with the complete respect of other practitioners of the healing arts. We know that we must travel in their company, for the backroads we might take alone are not to our desire.

It is worth noting that shortly after the above was written, Dr. Kintner co-authored a treatise with James A. Palmer, O.D., and A. Scott Gibson, O.D., entitled "Principles of Ethics and Economics for the Optometrist," which was published by the Department of Ethics and Economics of the American Optometric Association.

Edison overexposed:

Much has been written lately concerning the possible ocular hazards of artificial lighting, but there is nothing new about the causal relationship between lighting and "asthenopia". The inventor of the first successful incandescent bulb was well aware of this fact. The following is an excerpt from Thomas Edison's notebook for January 28, 1878, as reported by Ronald Clark in "Edison, the Man Who Made the Future," G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1977, p. 95:

"Owing to the enormous power of the light (alloy of nickel) my eye commenced to pain after seven hours work and I had to quit. Suffered the pains of hell with my eye last night from 10:00 p.m. to 4:00 a.m. when I got to sleep with a big dose of morphine. Eyes better, do not pain much at 4:00 p.m. but I doze today."

In all fairness I must state that at this time Edison was working feverishly to find the ideal material for a bulb filament. The seven hours work consisted primarily of observing the nature of the bulb glow. In other words, staring directly at the filament at close range!

D.K.P.

Leeds remembers Heather:

Responding to the suggestion in the previous issue that those who knew Dr. Heather should whip out a few paragraphs for the N.O.H.S., James P. Leeds, O.D., writes as follows:

You ask what I remember about "Jere" Heather. He was in some executive capacity at Northern Illinois College of Optometry when I first entered there in the fall of 1937. Some time during that semester he left for the American Optical Co. He taught us a course on, I believe, "Optometric Orientation". We all anticipated hearing him, as he was an original; and whoever followed him after he left suffered in comparison. He was a flamboyant person--egg bald, impeccably dressed with a boutonniere, pencil-thin mustache, large physique. His vocal delivery could best be described as bombastic, and he held everyone's attention. He was a character, and he knew it and played it to the hilt.

In the first class he asked why we were studying Optometry. There were all sorts of answers such as benefiting mankind, etc. Finally someone piped up that he thought he could make a good living from Optometry. This is what he was looking for. He roared that we were in it for the "dough" and he hoped we would all make it. Since [name deleted] was in the class, at least one got the message.

The summer prior to enrolling I drove to Chicago to view the school. Since a new class building was being built, the old one didn't bother me. But the Bernard Hotel, which was being taken over as a dorm, did. There were to be three freshmen to a room, a small one, with a single and a double bed with a \$3.00 weekly rent. Having just left a nice fraternity at the University of Michigan, I was, to say the least, underwhelmed. I wasn't rich, but I felt I could afford something better. I went in to see him, for that is where I was directed, and I was overwhelmed. He put his arm around me and said he would not permit me to stay where he would not want his own son to be, and he told me not to worry. When I arrived there, I was put in one of the small rooms. I hastened to my good friend, Dr. Heather, who was then less effusive; but when he saw I was not going to back down he permitted me to be in a larger room with a bed all to myself.

My last recollection was when he spoke to the Indiana Optometric Association with his wooden blocks and his economic message. Everyone who had known him was there, and he was warmly received. He knew how to fire everyone up. I don't remember his message, but it sticks to me that he said when he was lecturing in college about "umbra & perumbra or some other damn thing," we all appreciated the diminished importance of umbra & perumbra in our daily lives now that we were in practice.

He was an individual who, once known, was never forgotten.

Collecting gains:

Anything one collects has the potential of gaining in value. There may also be a time when one must sell it, for whatever reason. A truly valuable item may bring next to nothing if one does not have more than one potential buyer. And if one does get a good price, the Internal Revenue Service may tax the profit as a long or short term capital gain, or even as ordinary profit if the seller is deemed to be in the antique business.

These and other aspects of gaining a profit on items which you have collected or saved and may eventually sell are discussed in an article by D.W. Howard and Ralph Roberts entitled "Collector And Capital Gains: Nothing More Real Than The IRS" in the March 26, 1984, issue of Antique Week/Tri-State Trader. The authors urge the readers to write their Congressmen to tell them that they support keeping tangible assets covered under long-term capital gains treatment.

O.H.S. members from outside of the U.S.A. who are unfamiliar with the U.S. Internal Revenue Service may find most of this discussion a bit of gobbledegook. Indeed, we Americans find it so, too!

A lensmaker's success:

OHS President James Leeds sent me a 20 page 15 x 11 cm pamphlet by Michael Randall entitled, "Do You Think That Luck Is Against You?" reprinted from the September 1922 issue of The American Magazine, Vol. 94, pp. 56-57 and 126-130. It is the career story of J.J. Bausch. It was reprinted as a pamphlet by the Bausch & Lomb Optical Company, Rochester, New York, following Mr. Bausch's death at the age of 96 in 1926.

The story describes Bausch as having fought failures and reverses for sixty years before he began to "get the breaks". He remained personally active in the business until his death.

Thanks, Mike:

A note from OHS member Michael Obremškey, O.D., informs us that he is the person referred to by Mrs. Dorothy Sheard Allen as "my optometrist now" on page 13 of the January 1984 issue of N.O.H.S.

'Tis gratifying to your editor that such details are noticed, for it means that the NOHS is indeed being read by someone!

Historical tidings from East Germany:

Two historical articles appear in the March/April 1984 issue of Augenoptik, Vol. 101, No. 2, the optometric journal of East Germany. On page 34 is a brief account by G. Ludvik entitled "100 Jahre Jenaer Glaswerk" (A century of the Jena glassworks). It includes an artist's sketch of the plant in aerial view as it appears in 1884 and a portrait photograph of Otto Schott, who in 1882 founded a laboratory for glass technology and in 1884 the Jena glassworks "Schott und Genossen" (Schott and Associates). Among Schott's associates were Ernst Abbe and Carl and Roderich Zeiss.

On pages 40-41 is an article by U. Maxam entitled "200 Jahre Blindenbildung" (Two centuries of education for the blind). He credits Valentin Haüy (1745-1822) with the founding of the first school for the blind in the year 1784 in Paris. Louis Braille was born in the same year. A chronology of the establishment of schools for the blind in Vienna, Berlin, Dresden, Halle, Weimar, Hubertusburg, Neukloster, Leipzig, and elsewhere is included in the article together with recognition of the disruption during the "Faschistische" regime (1933-1945), the subsequent reorganization of blind school programs, and the establishment of the Blinden und Sehschwachen Verband der DDR (The Blind and Low Vision Association of East Germany) in 1957. More recently evolved is the East German program to provide special training and education to visually handicapped children and tactile art education for the totally blind.

23 skiddoo!

Though still appearing in at least Webster's Third New International Dictionary this imperative verb phrase to express unadulterated annoyance obviously dates anyone who uses it. It means scat, scram, out damned spot, begone, or simply that something must be done at once about the matter at hand.

The matter at hand in this instance is a letter of invitation from the Continuing Education Committee Chairman of a major state optometric association to a body of potential lecturers whom he salutes as "Dear Colleague:". The recipient is invited to submit

lectures to be considered for the association's education program in any of 22 course categories ranging alphabetically from "Basic Sciences" to "Visuo-Motor, Perceptual Motor, Visual Integrative" and including such other topical categories as "Lens Therapy," "Hypnosis," "Practice Management," and "Specifically for Doctor's Spouses." Indeed, it appears that the Committee struggled to exhaust the topical terminology to accommodate every possible subject matter of any conceivable optometric relevance. To safeguard this total inclusiveness one of the 22 categories is labeled "Miscellaneous." Not "Other." "Miscellaneous." This is the only possible category in which a lecture or two on some significant phase of optometric history could be entered, however misfittingly.

What, should we not ask, is so bad about optometric history that in a five day program for thousands of listeners it might only be offered legitimately under the category of "Miscellaneous". Roget deems this term synonymous with mishmash, hodgepodge, and hash.

To that committee's list of 22, I say 23 skiddoo!

More archival gems:

Recently Barbara Sargent of the Indiana Health Professions Service Bureau thoughtfully forwarded to me a bundle of long-filed papers from the discarded holdings of the optometry licensing board to dispose of as I see fit. State board offices are becoming overcrowded and find it necessary to discard or even shred records which no longer relate to board responsibilities. Ms. Sargent is keenly aware that among such documents are many, virtually secret, details of optometric history, details that rarely appeared candidly in print and are rapidly fading from living memory.

The earliest dated item is a letter of October 19, 1926, from Dr. William B. Needles, President, Northern Illinois College of Optometry to John H. Ellis, President, and C.D. Adair, Secretary of the Indiana State Board. The printed letterhead identifies the college as "INCORPORATED UNDER THE LAWS OF ILLINOIS" and "A Consolidation of Needles Institute of Optometry and Northern Illinois College of Ophthalmology and Otology" and the address as "710 CAPITOL BUILDING, CHICAGO, U.S.A." Dr. Needles informs the board of a student from Indianapolis who failed to graduate but who reports that he took the Indiana Board examinations and had everything "fixed."

Other correspondence deals at length with changes of educational requirements for licensure and the effects of eligibility of upcoming graduates. On March 21, 1938, Carl F. Shepard, O.D., Dean, Monroe University, 207 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill. wrote Dr. John P. Davey, Sec'y., Indiana State Board of Examiners, in application for recognition of the "Monroe University, School of Optometry" to enable its graduates

to take the Indiana Board examinations. Related to this application are numerous items of correspondence from the International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry; Wilbur F. Pell of Pell and Pell, Lawyers, Shelbyville, Indiana; Richard S. Kaplan, Attorney-at-law, Gary, Indiana; and Harold Kohn, Counsel for the American Optometric Association, plus a copy of the Indiana Board's decision of July 24, 1944, that ". . . the requirements of the Indiana Educational rule and the requirements of Monroe College are incompatible."

Another portion of the packet relates to the acceptability of graduates of the Northern Illinois College of Optometry and of the Chicago College of Optometry and a graduate of the two year course at Columbia University during the late '40s and early '50s. During those years the Indiana Board was negotiating for the establishment of an optometry school at Indiana University to meet its newly adopted educational requirements. I hesitate to discuss any of these more recent details in this brief commentary because several of the individuals in the controversy-filled scenario are still living and should not be identified in my very unsophisticated and easily biased review. What I can say without fear of contradiction, however, is that some of the correspondence clearly points to motives and intrigue that existed only as rumor in the public domain at the time (as I myself remember).

Prior to forwarding the whole packet to the International Library, Archives, and Museum of Optometry, Inc., I made copies of two of the documents for possible inclusion in full in this or a subsequent issue of NOHS.

Another optometrist memorialized:

The Homer Hendrickson Award was established in 1983 as an award of the Optometric Extension Program Foundation by David Dzik, O.D., to recognize "optometrists who implement or participate in behaviorally-oriented public service programs."

Optics award to Wichterle:

Professor Otto Wichterle of Prague, Czechoslovakia, born October 27, 1913, is the recipient of the 1984 R.W. Wood Prize of the Optical Society of America. The prize is intended to recognize an outstanding discovery, scientific or technological achievement, or invention in the field of optics. In this instance the recognition is of Professor Wichterle's "contributions to the development of soft contact lenses."

Biographic and technical details of the award are reported on page 17 of the March/April 1984 issue of Optics News, Vol. 10. No. 2.

Two "History of Ophthalmology" books:

Two books of this title arrived in my favorite library during the same week of April 1984. One is by George Gorin, Publish or Perish, Inc., Wilmington, Delaware 1982. The other is Vol. 1 of Frederick C. Blodi's translation of Julius Hirschberg, Verlag J.P. Wayenborgh, Bonn, West Germany, 1982. [To readers who are not university affiliated I should explain that the acquisition of books by university libraries is a painfully slow process. The delays involve requisitioning, ordering, delivering, cataloguing, and shelf assignment, each a substantial decision-making procedure requiring, or at least consuming, time.]

The Gorin book is an almost encyclopedic chronology organized by eras in country by country and even state by state fashion. Included are several hundred photographs of individual ophthalmologists, 299 references, and an index of approximately 3,000 entries. The text is largely biographical. The history of early ophthalmology, especially that prior to this century, is dealt with very candidly. Visual science, per se, is scarcely touched upon; the terms eyeglasses, lenses, optician, optics, optometry, spectacles, and vision do not appear in the index and rarely in the text, though the history of glasses is briefly discussed in relation to the renaissance. The relatively recent entry of ophthalmologists into the field of refraction is dealt with quite factually. The opening sentence of a section entitled "Optics and Physiology of the Eye" states, "The most important work was done by Johannes Kepler, who is the 'Father of modern optics.'"

The book deserves a much more substantial review than these few comments, as it is certainly a fine reference, especially for information on individual ophthalmologists, including many still living.

The Hirschberg volume is the first of a series of eleven and deals only with ophthalmology in antiquity. In this instance antiquity corresponds with history prior to about the fifth century A.D. especially in the locales of Egypt, India, Tibet, China, Japan, Greece, and Rome. The term ophthalmology comprehensively includes anything involving the eye and its functions.

Hirschberg (1843-1925) was not only a German ophthalmologist of stature who had read nearly all of his great many sources in their original language, except Sanskrit, but had a competent background in mathematics and optics. His well disciplined philosophy is conveyed in the following translated comment about most other historical accounts: ". . . the study of the true sources is a difficult and time-consuming task and it has been replaced by the copying of quotations. These will contain more and more mistakes the more frequently they have been copied." [I was careful to copy this correctly!--H.W H.]

The author's etymological efforts to interpret precisely the meanings of the original authors of antiquity are superb. For example, his own version of Emperor Nero's variously interpreted observation of fights of the gladiators in an emerald is that "Nero sat in his stall in the circus and turned his back to the public while observing the fights in a beautiful green mirror." This probably unique interpretation was by no means a whim, for he supported it with extensive references to the existence of emerald, mirrors, and the sunny weather of Nero's day as well as the direct translation itself.

He also tried exhaustively and unsuccessfully to resolve the etymological ambiguity of the terms hemeralopia and nyctalopia through their ancient origins. In his 29 page section on "The Science of Optics in Ancient Greece" he flatly declared that Claudius Ptolemaeus (ca. 150 A.D.) was "The most important author on optics in antiquity." This statement is reinforced by the delineations of much of Ptolemaeus's writing and experimentation in physiological as well as geometric optics.

Hirschberg's extensive uncovering of numerous references to the perception of color in ancient writings leaves little doubt that human color vision existed in the earliest periods of recorded history about as it is now. His exposition of ancient references to normal, pathological, traumatic, and anomalous conditions of the eye and their treatment or management by whatever kinds of practitioners is incredibly thorough. Dr. Blodi, the translator, expresses the opinion that no other medical specialty has such a history available. It must be true.

Roger Bacon, Ophthalmic Scientist (1214-1294):

This is the title of an article in the March 3, 1984, issue of The Ophthalmic Optician, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 160-165, by Walter Gasson, whose historical writings have been cited frequently in this newsletter. Gasson tells us of the conjectured place and date of Bacon's birth, his academic career and associations, his personality, involvements and controversies with the authorities and church, and episodes of his wealth, poverty, and imprisonment.

The manuscripts of Opus Majus, Opus Tertium and Opus Minus were completed, in Latin, in an 18 month period while Bacon was in his early fifties, but not published until 1733, almost five centuries later. Gasson derives most of his article material from R. Belle-Burke's translation entitled "Roger Bacon: Opus Majus" Russell & Russell, New York 1962.

Gasson includes a few quotations from Belle-Burke's translation, such as the following:

There are four main principal stumbling blocks to comprehending the truth, which hinder well nigh every scholar, the example of frail and unworthy authority, long established custom, the sense of the ignorant crowd, and the hiding of one's ignorance under the shadow of wisdom.

Another, of interest to the optometrist, is his elaboration on the importance of magnification especially for presbyopes by the use of a glass sphere placed on reading matter, as follows:

If any man examine letters or other minute objects through the medium of crystal or glass or other transparent substance, if it be shaped like the lesser segment of a sphere, with the convex side towards the eye, and the eye being in the air, he will see the letters far better, and they will seem larger to him.

It was this statement that gave rise to the speculation by some that Bacon was the real inventor of spectacles.

Gasson gives us an excellent synopsis of Part 5 of Volume II of Opus Majus, including several figures, in which Bacon thoroughly discusses the general principles of visual science in all its branches. These branches include the psychological and metaphysical aspects of visual science, medieval ocular anatomy, the optical schematics of the eye, the optical properties of its anatomical components, perception of light and color, medieval acuity theory, ocular ray tracing theory, nine prerequisites for vision (light, object distance, object location, object size, contrast, media transparency, exposure time, eye health, and angular subtense), and numerous optical experiments and visual phenomena.

In addition to the outline of Bacon's ophthalmic optical contributions Gasson devotes several paragraphs to Bacon's final tragic years and some of the legendary traditions and inventions that have been attributed to him. Thirteen references are given, as well as acknowledgement of help from others, including Miss Jennifer Taylor, librarian of the British College of Ophthalmic Opticians.

Lady O.D.s describe earlier days:

There are indications that women have never categorically been excluded from the profession of optometry. Their numbers were small primarily because few elected to enter the profession, but among the few there were some notable successes.

The experiences in the careers of six who are still actively involved in optometry are highlighted in the April 1984 issue of

Optometry Times, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 8-9, as interviewed by Barbara J. Hammond under the caption "Women in Optometry". Included are Dorothy Bergin, O.D., a 1945 graduate of the Los Angeles College of Optometry, Lois Bing, O.D., a 1948 graduate of The Ohio State University, Dorothy McCoy, O.D., a 1939 graduate of the Southern College of Optometry, Libby Sukoff, O.D., a 1955 graduate of Columbia University, Treasure Wheeler, O.D., a 1968 graduate of Pacific University, and Elizabeth E. Caloroso, O.D., a 1953 graduate of the University of California, Berkeley.

College history to be published:

On May 20, 1984, James R. Gregg, O.D., a charter member of OHS and a former member of the OHS Executive Board was named Professor Emeritus of the Southern California College of Optometry in recognition of his 37 years of service. In September, a new book, his thirteenth, "The Origin and Development of the Southern California College of Optometry, 1904-1984" will be released.

Henry Knoll remembers Heather:

"Upon my return from a brief vacation in Denmark and Sweden, I found Volume 12 # 2 among the accumulated items of mail. I hasten to write you my recollections of Jere Heather.

"The name Jere Heather brings forth an image of a ruddy face and a rotund body covered with sweat (Jere was an earthy person, hence sweat, not perspiration!) enthusiastically expounding on his subject of professional optometric economics. His zeal was demonstrated by the removal of his coat after the first minute of each presentation.

"I had the good fortune to hear him speak on several occasions and I enjoyed every one of his presentations. As Dean of the Los Angeles College of Optometry, I was privileged to visit with him in his hotel room after the gathering. After putting on a dry shirt he invited us all to enjoy some of his beloved applejack. I have yet to meet another applejack fancier.

"Others tried to fill Jere's shoes, but none were able to pull it off. Jere was one of a kind. A real optometric legend."

"Currie's packet" explained:

The conjecture in the January issue of NOHS, p. 23, that Donald Currie's packet was probably a boat is solidly confirmed by Dr. D.H. Reynolds, a tugboat buff, boat historian, and optometrist of Johannesburg, South Africa, in the following letter:

You refer to Donald Currie's packet, the name given to any one of Donald Currie's liners that sailed on a weekly basis from Durban to Southampton. We should not dismiss Donald Currie too quickly. He challenged the Union Line for supremacy on the South African coastline, and he did so so effectively that the Union Line had to bow to Currie's pressure and amalgamate with him to form what became known as the Union-Castle Line.

Currie's ships had always been known by the affix "Castle". So strong was Currie's influence that from that time on the Union-Castle Liners all bore the affix "Castle," such as "Pendennis Castle" and "Windsor Castle". The steamships left the route in 1978 to everyone's regret.

Donald Currie also gave his name and some of his wealth to South Africa's primary sporting trophys and to this day South Africans at cricket and rugby compete for the Currie Cup Trophy.

The camera obscura:

This simplest of optical aids is hardly known today though at one time invaluable to astronomers, artists, and travellers, and popular as a dilettante's toy. A fifth century B.C. Chinese philosopher Mo Ti is said to have been the first to record the creation of an inverted image with a pinhole in a screen. The subsequent centuries saw continuing technical improvements of application of the principle into the 19th century when the camera obscura reached the height of its popularity as a useful technical device and as an entertaining diversion. It has almost been forgotten in the twentieth century except as it is displayed in museums. Also, on occasion the public is instructed via newspapers and television how to construct a camera obscura out of a pasteboard box for safe viewing of eclipses of the sun.

Such history is well covered in a 1981 book of 182 pages entitled "The Camera Obscura: A Chronicle" by John H Hammond and published by Adam Hilger Ltd, Techno House, Redcliffe Way, Bristol, England BS1 6NX. More than 100 illustrations, a bibliography of at least 500 documents, and a substantial index make it an outstanding source of information as well as interesting reading. The author's collection of notes, references, and material on the camera obscura is now at the Science Museum Library, South Kensington, London.

Litsinger on Heather:

O.H.S. member George G. Litsinger, O.D., recalls an incident that portrays Jere Heather in typical form, as follows:

Regarding Wm Jerome Heather: While I was still a student at N.I.C.O. 1929-1931. I asked Dr. Heather if he would care to lecture to our young peoples Methodist group. He arrived through a pouring rain. When asked what I could pay him, he said "Send me a book". Unaware that he had reached 40, I sent him "Life Begins at Forty".

When an article appeared in the Opt. J. Rev. Optom., vol 110 No. 12, June 15, 1973, I asked if he remembered that horrible Sunday night. He replied by letter: July 5, 1973:

Dear George:

Greetings and hearty best wishes!

Your letter brought me great joy, and let loose a thousand great and pleasant memories. For that, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Silly boy . . . do I remember you? Sure I do, and my memory at the Oak Park, Illinois, Methodist Meeting, I think in 1934. You will discover my memory surpasses yours, let that give you a jolt.

I'm glad there was no gratuity; why should there be! I was born and raised a Methodist, and my brother Fred is a retired Methodist minister.

After flying a million and a half air-miles in my work, what was a little rain!

Yes, your group presented me with a book with the title: "Life Begins At 40". Born in 1894, I was 40 on that occasion.

When I opened the book, you had drawn a sketch of me, bald-headed, flower in buttonhole, portly . . . the works! I was at that time carefully brushing a few little wisps of hair, and "lightly" resented it. Today, I tell the story with zest.

You are 63 and I am 78, so hang in and work for your fortune, but don't be too sure it will be money. Write me!

Love, Jere

105 George Muck Drive
Kerrville South, TX 78028

Dr. Litsinger's letter reminds us that his pen and ink caricature of Heather et al appeared on page 2 of the January 1979 issue of N.O.H.S., Vol. 10, No. 1.

A note from historian Hale:

O.H.S. member J.R. Hale, O.D., of Sunnyside, Washington, reports that he is preparing a series of historical articles about optometry in the Pacific Northwest to be published in Washington Optometry Today. He will tell us what past governor of the state of Washington was an optometrist, and who was the first lady president of a school of optometry. He also informs us that the son of one of the past leaders of the Seattle College of Optometry is retiring and has donated the official seal of the college to the state association.

Dr. Hale advises us that he is the only living member of a family of seven doctors of optometry.

Appreciated:

The doubling of our annual dues appears to have prompted the thought of contributing something extra. Thus, for example, OHS members Irving Bennett and Bert C. Hersch added fifteen and ten extra dollars respectfully as tokens of appreciation when they paid their 1984 dues.

Collection now; history later:

What may be a unique hobby is that of Arol R. Augsburger, O.D., Clinical Associate Professor of Optometry at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. He collects the eyewear of contemporary celebrities, and photographs of them wearing glasses. He simply writes his request directly to each celebrity of interest asking the favor of donation of a no longer used pair of his or her glasses together with a photograph of the celebrity wearing them.

Dr. Augsburger also is the curator of the optometry museum collection in The Ohio State University College of Optometry. Obviously, his collection of the glasses of present day famous persons, together with their many interesting and sometimes telltale responses to his requests, will soon, if not already, be of historical significance.

His project is described on page 8 of the March 15, 1984, issue of the American Optometric Association News, Vol. 23, No. 6.