

OPT

OPTOMETRY LIBRARY

JUN 02 1986

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NEWSLETTER
OF THE
OPTOMETRIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Vol. 17

April, 1986

Indiana University Number 2

MAY 19 1986

Library

1986 O.H.S. Executive Board officers

The five-member Executive Board has voted among themselves for the 1986 officers. The results are as follows:

- President - Jerome Abrams
- Vice President - James Leeds
- Secretary-Treasurer - Maria Dablemont
- Trustees - Pat Carlson
- Andrew Fischer

O.H.S. by-law amendments:

Over fifty O.H.S. members responded to the ballot enclosed with the January Newsletter. The first amendment was approved unanimously and the second with only one negative vote. The By-laws will now read as follows (deletions are in parentheses and additions are underlined):

Article IV, Section 1: The Executive Board shall consist of seven (five) members, each to be elected by the membership for a four (five) year term except as here noted. Three shall be elected in 1986 to begin their terms on January 1, 1987, one to begin a term of four years to succeed the previous board member whose term expires December 31, 1986, another to begin a term of three years, and the third to begin a term of two years. Thereafter the number to be elected each year for four-year terms shall be the number necessary to replace the board member or board members whose term or terms are due to expire as defined at their respective time or times of election.

Article IV, Section 4: The Executive Board shall elect from among themselves a President, a Vice President, (and a Secretary-Treasurer) a Secretary, and a Treasurer, and the remaining members of the Executive Board shall be designated Trustees.

Fischer's annual gifts:

O.H.S. Director Andrew F. Fischer, O.D., made his 1986 membership gifts to Don B. Echols, O.D., and four optometric journal editors, as follows: Mr. Jody Stone of 20/20, Mr. Brian Perry of Optical Index, Mr. Richard Guerrin of Chilton's Review of Optometry, and Ms. Cathy Chiaramonte of Optometry Times.

If editors can be made to realize the significance of knowing our heritage they may well allow that realization to stimulate a greater history content in their publications. It is one of our major aims to encourage this. We want to preserve the role of catalyst, not of competitor, among serial publications.

Hummel explains:

At the top of page 59 of the October 1985 issue of the NOHS the question was raised, "Is it possible that optometry's role in industry was blooming nationwide in that era (the '20s) and perhaps got nipped by the Great Depression?" In response, OHS member D. G. Hummel, O.D., writes, "I did industrial work from 1928 to 1933 with the Betts Optical Co. and was very busy. Optometric opposition killed this work. In-office examinations were subsequently done by optometrists Hall, Higgins, and me."

He adds, "If there was ophthalmological opposition I was unaware of it. Jealousy and narrow thinking on the part of the Optometric Association killed this excellent opportunity. This in spite of one optometrist bringing his figures showing an increase in his practice with the advent of industrial screening."

On unconventionality, mysticism, and validity:

Prior to October 1937, there appeared an undated 96 page paperback book, 21 x 14 cm, in English entitled "Prevention and Cure of Disease of the Eye" by Graf Wiser, M.D., oculist at Bad Eilsen, Germany, published by Hanover (Germany) Bruno Wilkens, and printed in Germany by F. Vieweg and Son, Brunswick [Braunschweig]. No one having been credited with the English translation, it appears to have been so written by the author, who identified himself further as "Geh. Medizinalrat," a title similar to medical privy councillor. Bad Eilsen is not listed in three atlases searched, suggesting it to be, or to have been, a small village or suburb. OHS member James P. Leeds, O.D., has a copy of the book in his collection.

Five chapters, 35 pages, deal exclusively with accommodation, its effects and management, and the correction of refractive troubles. Dr. Wiser takes exception to the theories of the American oculist Wm. H. Bates, M.D., of "Throw away your glasses" fame, and presents his own equally bizarre theories involving the use of plus spherical lenses of the order of 25 (not 0.25) diopters and higher to cure myopia and numerous other ocular conditions.

Declaring that atropine will not relax a real "spasmus accommodationis" he first "examined the cornea with an ophthalmoscope to detect possible irregularities in the curvature" and then undertook a vaguely but emphatically described refractive procedure with convex lenses intended to relax the accommodation. He explains, "It is of great importance for the patient to wear the new convex glasses and prisms at once. The eyes must not be allowed to return to their former degree of accommodation. It is, therefore, necessary for the oculist to have an optician on the spot. The patient must be given, and must wear, the presented glasses at once. The optician must . . . be able to supply them in about ten minutes."

In another paragraph it is stated, "Relaxation of the ciliary muscle is greatly assisted by reading with a magnifying glass of +35.0 diopters. I also prescribe irrigations, or fomentations, to which I add varying medicinal ingredients to stimulate the circulation." This is the only instance in which there is a hint that perhaps such high powered convex lenses may be used as hand-held rather than spectacle-mounted optics.

In the October 1937 issue of the British Journal of Physiological Optics, Vol. XI, pp. 137-145, the book was extensively reviewed in an article

entitled "The Work of Graf Wiser, M.D." by "W.B.B.", who undoubtedly was W. B. Barker, an ophthalmic optician. The reviewer pointed out that "For several years, a few English opticians have had the opportunity of seeing English patients of Geheimrat Graf Wiser, a German oculist, whose methods of treatment in individual instances have produced somewhat astounding results." He added that he himself had "had the opportunity of seeing quite a number of Dr. Graf Wiser's cases, and the results seem to merit serious consideration and wider publicity." Further, "The organized medical profession in Germany regard his methods as unorthodox, but his success is so great that a large new clinic is being built at Bad Eilsen, and, each year, an increasing number of patients from all over the world attend for treatment." Barker described the majority of such patients as "forlorn hopes" and that every patient of Wiser's that he had seen reported "considerable improvement after treatment" and spoke "with the highest enthusiasm of Dr. Wiser and his work."

Barker described one of his referrals as hopelessly blind with a "trifling" refractive error, central choroiditis and partial cataract in each eye. "After two or three visits to the Bad Eilsen Clinic in successive years, the patient was wearing for close work, at about three inches from the eyes, convex lenses in the region of +28.00 diopters, with prisms of about 20^Δ, and he now reads, on the average, two novels a week, as well as the daily paper and gets about in the traffic of a busy city without the slightest difficulty."

Another patient with choroiditis and medial opacities was described by Barker as having a myopia of about ten diopters in each eye with attainable acuity of the order of 9/60. Wiser prescribed O.D. +1.00 sph, O.S. +3.75 sph. for distance and O.D. +28.00, O.S. +45.00 for reading. Barker reported "remarkable changes in visual acuity" and substantial reduction of myopia when he re-examined the patient by the usual routine methods.

In the April 1939 issue of the British Journal of Physiological Optics, Vol. XIII, no. 1, pp. 21-32, shortly after Dr. Wiser's death, there appeared an article entitled "Some Observations on Ocular Refractive Treatment with Special Reference to the Graf Wiser Technique" by the prominent ophthalmic optician H. B. Marton. He reported his observations on about twenty patients who had been treated at the Bad Eilsen clinic over a period of some years. "In every case the patient received benefit from it." Marton himself also undertook the treatment of several cases "according to a modified Wiser technique" with results "sufficiently impressive to merit notice." After describing several of his cases and observations and discussing the claims of Wiser and other unconventional theorists Marton says he "wishes to make it clear that he has no desire to assume an unqualified advocacy of the methods here described."

Indeed, the criteria for validity can be most elusive.

Attention, state journal editors:

During most of the current century a variety of journals serving state optometric associations have come and gone. Those of us who have long had the opportunity to peruse many of them often wonder what basic needs they fill. The March 1986 issue of Texas Optometry (Vol. 42, no. 3), one of the few long-surviving state periodicals, reminded me of one very significant role that they can play with responsive readership, high documentary value, and uncontested interest.

I refer to the inclusion of well prepared obituaries for deceased members who have contributed to the development of the profession within the state. In this instance the obituary, entitled "The Passing of a Legend", was for the late Nelson Greeman, Sr., O.D., a most prominent Texas optometrist who passed away on November 30, 1985.

Though the author was unfortunately not identified, the article contained much optometric history as well as an intimate portrayal of Dr. Greeman, supplemented by his picture on the front cover. He had practiced optometry in Texas for 61 years. Even those who might not have known Dr. Greeman will find the account interesting. Furthermore, because Texas Optometry is bound and preserved in several libraries the record of his accomplishments are now effectively memorialized in perpetuity, more lasting than a portrait, statue, or headstone.

State journal editors may respond by complaining that they cannot find persons to write the obituaries. Actually this is not difficult, as I can attest from my own editing of a state optometric journal for several years. The procedure is simple. Upon the death of a member an obituary committee should be appointed, two or three persons to include at least one from the deceased's home community who has access to local newspaper write-ups, and who can consult surviving members of the family, the mortician, and close friends. The appointment may be made by the Editor or by the association President.

The obituary can be published virtually anytime within a year or so after the occurrence of death. In a state that can support a monthly or quarterly journal there are typically enough optometrists to necessitate an obituary in virtually every issue. Frankly, I can say that it will be the obituary that will be turned to first by the great majority of readers. Not only will it satisfy our human interest hunger but it will help make us realize how greatly our colleagues contribute to society. Finally, it will help in the documentation of our optometric history.

H.W H.

Competing collectors escalate costs:

Ever alert OHS member Irving Bennett called our attention to a letter from OHS member D. C. Davidson to the editor of The Optician, another OHS member, published in the January 17, 1986 issue, Vol. 191, no. 5029, page 10, in which it was reported that a pair of silver spectacles made in London in 1799 was recently auctioned at a record price of £2,200 (\$3,000).

Mr. Davidson is the president of the Ophthalmic Antiques International Collectors Club.

Early optical giants:

A brief commentary on the scientific support roles of Carl Snell, Ernst Abbe, Carl Zeiss, and Otto Schott is entitled "Als das Fenster zur Mikrowelt geöffnet wurde" (Upon opening the window to the micro-world) in the November-December 1985 issue of Augenoptik, Vol. 102, no. 6, p. 188. Authored

by Margit Kasper, it describes the circumstances of their involvement in the design and manufacture of optical instruments which facilitated the improved viewing of microorganisms.

Ivy Parnum Giles:

Many who are familiar with international aspects of optometric history will remember Ivy Parnum Giles, whose death on December 16, 1985, was brought to our attention by her sister Mrs. Jean Guttman. The two sisters had been living together in retirement for nine years at Hotel Eden Roc, Puerto de la Cruz, Tenerife, Canary Islands, subsequent to the deaths of their husbands with a few months of each other.

Miss Ivy Parnum was employed by Secretary J. H. Sutcliffe of the British Optical Association in the 1920's. In about 1927 when Mr. Sutcliffe was elected President of the newly established International Optical League she was appointed Secretary, but that was not until she had learned the German language as ordered to do by Mr. Sutcliffe to enable them to take part in I.O.L. meetings on the Continent. She served both the B.O.A. and the I.O.L., (later I.O.O.L.) in a secretarial role, and often management role, throughout her half century career. For a time she served also on the Whitley Council (a British Government Department), and when the Opticians Act was put through Parliament by Sir Ronald Russell she attended the House of Commons with George Giles as an information resource during the debates. Mr. Giles had succeeded Sutcliffe in both the B.O.A. and I.O.O.L. roles. Ivy became a close friend of the Giles family and in the early '60's she and the first Mrs. Giles visited numerous American friends in a pleasure tour of the U.S.A. Subsequent to the first Mrs. Giles' death Ivy and George were married. Continuing in her organizational roles she thereafter became known to the later members of the Optometric world as Ivy Giles.

Upon George's death she was asked to manage the drive for funds for the G. H. Giles Memorial Auditorium at the London Refraction Hospital, which resulted in donations exceeding \$100,000.

In a brief outline of the history of the International Optometric and Optical League written by the long time delegate Peter Abel of Germany in 1977 the secretarial role of Ivy Giles, nee Parnum, was specifically mentioned as a major contribution in the league's half century of development and success.

When Ivy retired she was made an honorary Fellow of the British Optical Association, a rarely bestowed honor. She was made an honorary member of the Optometric Historical Society in January 1971. She was buried in the English Cemetery in Tenerife.

Those of us who had the pleasure of knowing her remember her with deep fondness, a thoughtful, understanding, brilliant lady of queenly demeanor with phenomenal secretarial capabilities coupled with charm and a sweet sense of humor, attributes that can mean the survival of even an international organization in floundering moments. She placed many a milestone in optometric history.

H.W H.

Our optometric movie mogul:

The almost forgotten pioneer of the moving picture industry, optometrist-optician Sigmund "Pop" Lubin, ca. 1851-1923, has been authentically and comprehensively written up in a 25 page chapter, pp. 99-124, entitled "The Movies' First Mogul" in "Jewish Life in Philadelphia 1830-1940". The book is an Institute for the Study of Human Issues publication, Philadelphia, edited by Murray Friedman. The chapter is by Professor Joseph Eckhardt and freelance writer Linda Kowall, both specializing in theatrical and cinematic history.

This account failed to meet my eye until it was brought to my attention by O.H.S. member Andrew F. Fischer, O.D. The subject is dealt with in fascinating detail, supported by 90 referenced citations and several photographs. The book is one very likely to be in your local public library. Personalities involved with Lubin's enterprises and career include such names as Thomas Edison, Cecil B. DeMille, Lillian Gish, Ronald Coleman, Oliver Hardy, Stan Laurel, Louis B. Mayer, Samuel Goldwin, the Warner brothers, and many others. They all had roles in his fabulous empire.

Regretfully, though frequent reference is made to Lubin's optical sophistication and skills, his early training is minimally discussed. He is described as "a learned man who possessed considerable technical skills, an extensive knowledge of chemistry and optics, and a degree from Heidelberg". He was occasionally referred to as "Professor" and sometimes as "Doctor".

As thoroughly as the chapter authors have dealt with Lubin's entrepreneurship, personality, and commercial maneuvers, especially in terms of the theme of the book as expressed in its title, it seems very probable that the authors must have accumulated extensive peripheral notes on Lubin's ophthalmic career as well. One or both of the authors should really be invited to tell that part of the story to an optometric audience.

Lubin started his American life as an "obscure Philadelphia optician", "At the height of his career his empire was estimated to be worth \$11 million", and "by the end of 1916 he was left with the family home in Atlantic City and the old optical shop in Philadelphia", spending "his last years in relative obscurity". His formal portraits were all of his left profile "to avoid showing his blind right eye". An 1881 front-view photograph of him suggests that his right eye was exotropic.

Like the few points mentioned here, the whole chapter makes very interesting reading.

H.W H.

The Ocular Heritage Society:

This society was founded in 1984 as an international organization of members who collect antique eyeglasses and other historical artifacts. Its current president, J. William Rosenthal, M.D., 3322 St. Claude Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70117 U.S.A., credits its founding to Audrey Davis, Ph.D., Curator, Medical Sciences Division, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. 20560. The other elected officers of

the society are O.H.S. member Alan York, O.D., and Spencer Sherman, M.D. Dues are \$25.00 per year, and membership is open to anyone having a scientific interest in the history of any or all ocular subjects.

The society's 1984 meeting was held at the Smithsonian Institution, the 1985 meeting at the American Optical Company Museum in Southbridge, Massachusetts, and this year's meeting at the Jonas W. Rosenthal Ophthalmic Museum in New Orleans on April 11-13. The 1987 meeting is scheduled to be at the American Academy of Ophthalmology Museum in San Francisco in 1987.

Within living memory:

In Part 2 of "Contact Lenses 1986" OHS member Neal Bailey recalls the "lot 010159" wetting solution contamination scare of 1959, the "Stone Report" scare of 1966, and a subsequent series of publicity-arousing incidents which had remarkable impact on the contact lens field, not all bad. The article appears on pages 29-30 and 32-33 of the February 1986 issue of Contact Lens Spectrum, Vol. 1, no. 2.

Photography history:

The history of photographic science and technology is the theme of a symposium to be held June 23-26, 1986, at the International Museum of History at the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York. It is believed that this may be the first conference on photographic history. It is sponsored by the Society of Photographic Scientists and Engineers, 7003 Kilworth Lane, Springfield, Virginia 22151.

While photography and optometry are hardly kin disciplines, they share many historical and technological parallels, and it does seem that many optometrists indulge in photographic hobbies at a rather sophisticated level. As Gertrude Stein might have said, a lens is a lens is a lens.

A century and a half of stereo:

Featured on half of the front page of the January 22, 1986, issue of the tabloid The Antique Trader Weekly, Vol. 30, no. 4, published in Dubuque, Iowa, is a photograph in color of six antique stereoscopes and assorted stereograms. They were popular parlor items during the "Golden Age" of stereo, circa 1855-1880, says Herman C. Carter in his article "The Wonderland of Stereo" filling pages 56 to 59, well illustrated with 15 photographs. He adds that there has probably never been a stronger interest in collecting stereo cameras, viewers, and view cards than we are experiencing today.

He perceives the chronology of major developmental events beginning with the inventions of Wheatstone in 1832 and Brewster in 1844. James Mascher in 1853 was the first American to patent a stereo viewer. In 1859 Oliver Wendell Holmes designed the popular and familiar "Holmes-type" hand-held viewer, calling it a "stereoscope" and the view cards "stereographs". It was later modified by Joseph Bates of Boston so that some collectors now call the popular model the "Holmes-Bates" type.

Mr. Carter gives a fascinating account of subsequent developments of stereoscopic viewers, cameras, processes, and photographs as well as

collecting hints, including a list of dedicated organizations, among them The National Stereoscopic Association, P. O. Box 14801, Columbus, Ohio 43214, U.S.A.

History in an obituary:

Mr. Robert Louis Sutcliffe, who died on November 15, 1985, at the age of 72, was not related to Robert and J. H. Sutcliffe, founders of the British Optical Association, but optometrically prominent in his own right. He was a teacher, practitioner, inventor, lecturer, and author. His obituary and a letter-to-the-editor addendum in the December 7, 1985, issue of Optometry Today (London), Vol. 25, no. 24, p. 821, are largely historical details of his more than 50 year ophthalmic career.

"It has a good eye":

This may mean something special to you if you are a breeder or fancier of carrier pigeons, according to a 1951 book of 63 pages by George F. Twombly entitled THE EYE, published by The Pigeon News, Medford, Massachusetts. A frontispiece illustrates 17 artist's drawings of external views of pigeons' eyes in color. Much of the book discusses their appearance, with special emphasis on the colors, shadings, widths, etc. of the pupillary borders.

The book includes a "Study of the Great Families", said to be edited from a series of "old manuscripts on the eyes of each strain that make up our present homing pigeon."

Altogether the book is more about pigeons than about eyes, and that which is about eyes is merely about their appearance. Optometrically it is not very enlightening, though perhaps the pigeon fancier understands.

Sam, Lyndon, and Luci:

OHS member Frank Brazelton, O.D., sent us a copy of page 81 of "The Years of Lyndon Johnson" by Robert A. Caro, published by Knopf, New York, in 1982, which included commentary about President Johnson's father Sam Ealy Johnson, as follows:

Sometimes he seemed almost to relish standing alone. He fought--against the powerful Texas Medical Association--for the right of optometrists to practice in Texas, and his son would later say that the fact that optometrists had "little money and influence" and were "opposed by a powerful enemy at the time my father took up their cause was--for me--a sufficient explanation of why he chose to stand beside them. Those were the kinds of causes Sam Ealy Johnson enjoyed."

Dr. Brazelton adds:

"This is the excerpt I mentioned to you in Atlanta concerning the role Lyndon Johnson's father played in the passage of the optometry practice act in Texas. I do not know the specific date of the legislation but Sam Ealy

Johnson served in the Texas legislature from 1918-1924. He seems to have been, altogether, a much more admirable character than his son."

"It is an intriguing speculation whether there is any connection between this incident and the later relationship between his [Sam's] granddaughter, Luci, and optometry. Perhaps one of your correspondents or an O.H.S. member can shed some light on it."

Radiant therapy:

Responding to a comment on page 60 of the October issue of this newsletter, OHS member Louis Allgeyer, O.D., reminds us that Jack I. Kurtz, O.D., had a fairly comprehensive chapter entitled, "Light Therapy: The Effects of Ultra Violet and Infrared Upon the Eye" in his 1930 book, "The Principles and Practice of Ocular Physical Therapy for Optometrists." Dr. Allgeyer tells us that Kurtz for many years shared office space with Carel Koch, O.D. Allgeyer's copy of Kurtz's book is inscribed by the author to his friend Dr. Guy Duplessis, another frequent author of that era. Dr. Allgeyer recently donated this and more than 50 other books to ILAMO.

A welcome innovation:

In the Premier Issue of Contact Lens Spectrum, January 1986, the well known editor and OHS member Neal J. Bailey, O.D., Ph.D., authored two historical articles on contact lenses. One, entitled "Contact Lenses, 1986", pp. 29-31, describes events of the year 1985 involving the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The other, entitled "The Contact Lens Primer: A Brief History," pp. 68-69, highlights evolvments from Leonardo da Vinci (1508) to Kevin Tuohy (1948), including an assertion that Dennis England, O.D., unsuccessfully applied for a corneal contact lens patent 25 months before Tuohy.

Dr. Bailey promises continuation of both articles in future issues of the new journal.

Omega Epsilon Phi history:

Irving E. Levy, O.D., an optometry alumnus of the Ohio State University who had served as the first president of the Eta Chapter of Omega Epsilon Phi, thoughtfully sent me his copy of the fraternity's 30th Anniversary Directory edited by Sidney B. Katz and published in December 1949. A substantial book of about 100 pages, it includes photographs of the 1949-50 national officers and its 12 honorary members; three pages of history; the name, location, charter date, and names of charter members of each of its 10 chapters; an alphabetical list of about 2,000 graduate members with their affiliations, academic credentials, and addresses; chapter-by-chapter lists of undergraduate members; and a list of 28 deceased members.

The fraternity was founded at Columbia University in October 12, 1919, "in the Executive Room in Earl Hall" as "an organization which would transcend the bounds of race, color and creed". A constitution was drawn up and adopted May 6, 1920. On April 6, 1921, the Trustees signed incorporation papers which

were legally recorded and filed with the State of New York on March 12, 1923. The chapter at Columbia University thereby became the Alpha Chapter.

It is not stated in this brief history how the Greek letters Omega Epsilon Phi were chosen as the national name. Perhaps this information is in the initiation rituals.

At a banquet sponsored in 1920 at the Collegiate Club in New York City the following six persons were elected to Honorary membership: Andrew J. Cross, James P. C. Southall, Frederic A. Woll, Charles F. Prentice, Charles Sheard, and E. LeRoy Ryer.

The last paragraph of the history leads off with the interesting statement, "Amidst a turbulent world where friendships, ethics, and tolerance are rapidly vanishing, the fraternity as a stable unit can and must be a force in counteracting the disappearance of the qualities."

Whatever the eventual impact of fraternity activity may have been, its heyday corresponded well with the period of time represented in this publication. Optometric fraternities, of which there have been several, were certainly on the fringe of the general academic fraternity milieu, but the pattern and spirit were at least imitative. The book, therefore, now has value for the archival scholar. Some of its information may in fact be virtually unavailable elsewhere, such as bits of data about individual optometrists. The well preserved photography of James P. C. Southall, for example, is the only one I recall ever having seen of him. For reasons like this the book belongs on the accessible shelves of The International Library, Archives and Museum of Optometry, where I shall send it.

H.W H.

17th century solar energy use:

Perhaps on the fringe of optometric history but nevertheless fascinating to anyone familiar with optical mechanisms is the era of burning lenses and solar furnaces. A principal contributor to the design and manufacture of such instruments was the optician, mathematician, physicist, and philosopher Count Ehrenfried Walther von Tschirnhaus, 1651-1708. A review of the development and use of burning lenses appears in a two part article entitled "Spiegel- und Linsensysteme im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert zur Nutzung der Sonnenenergie" (17th and 18th century mirror and lens systems for the utilization of solar energy) by K. Schillinger in the March-April and September-October 1985 issues of Augenoptik, Vol. 102, nos. 2 and 5, pp. 56-57 and 151-154.

Illustrated are several models on tripods or wheels, including one with a 130 cm diameter glass lens and another with a 158 cm diameter mirror of polished metal. Also shown is a French-made reflecting model consisting of 48 individually directed polished flat squares that appear to be about 5 x 5 cm in size. Two of the illustrations show the front and back of an inscribed commemorative medal melted and cast with the aid of a Tschirnhaus burning glass.

Seventy references are given.

An old book about arcus senilis:

The beginning of super-specialization in the eyecare field may well be epitomized by an 1863 book entitled "On the ARCUS SENILIS, or Fatty Degeneration of the Cornea" by Edwin Canton, London. The 240 page clothbound book has eight chapters, among them Chapter IV on "The occasional non-occurrence of the Arcus in Old Age" and Chapter VI on "The Formation of the Arcus in the Intemperate."

While the occasional focus of the text is on the arcus senilis ("old man's bow"), the peripheral excursions into general medical factors predominate. For example, Chapter IV deals almost exclusively with the broad issues of aging and longevity. A single illustration among many is the following quotation from Bellefroid in an 1839 Belgian medical bulletin. "To lead a life which is to endure, one must be neither king, nor, beggar: have enough to satisfy the wants of nature, and, little that is superfluous. He must be regulated by the rules, and, precepts of piety: possess but little imagination, and, as a consequence, be but little troubled with the passions, and, vices. He must not be a physician."

The author seems eminently qualified, being then president of the medical society of London, surgeon to the British Museum, lecturer in anatomy, and surgeon at two ophthalmic hospitals. His frequent citations show great familiarity with the medical literature, though there is not even a casual reference to ocular optics or visual effects, or even a dismissal of their relevance. The anecdotal style of writing is typical of the time.

This is another volume on loan from the collection of O.H.S. member James Leeds, O.D.

Early soft lens history:

Pierre Rocher, O.D., of Paris, France, believes that the first public information on hydrogel biological material may have appeared in Nature in 1960 in an article by Professor Wichterle and D. Lim. He believes also that the first ophthalmic reaction to the published article did not appear until the spring of 1963 in L'Opticien Belge. In May or June 1963 Dr. Rocher started a correspondence which led to his meeting with Professor Wichterle and Dr. Max Dreifus, an ophthalmologist, in Czechoslovakia.

These recollections and several subsequent developments in soft lens history are recorded in a letter from Dr. Rocher published in the February 1986 issue of Contact Lens Forum, Vol. 11, no. 2, p. 56.

O.H.S. member Pat Carlson thoughtfully called this to our attention.

The medieval eye:

Prompted by a note a year ago from OHS member and librarian Pat Carlson I withdrew a copy of Bruce Stansfield Eastwood's monograph, "The Elements of Vision: The Micro-Cosmology of Galenic Visual Theory According to Hunayn Ibn Ishāk", from the Indiana University Library. The 62 page book is in fact Part 5 of Volume 72 of the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1982.

Hunayn, A.D. 808-873, was an Iraqi physician, philosopher, theologian, and probably best known as a translator of Greek. His scientific significance is well attested by a 20 page write-up in the 1978 Dictionary of Scientific Biography, Supplement 1, pp. 230-249. Eastwood's principal resource, which he quoted extensively, was "The Book of the Ten Treatises on the Eye Ascribed to Hunain ibn Is-hâq" edited and translated by Max Meyerhof and published in Cairo, Government Press, 1928.

Eastwood identifies three traditions in the history of medieval visual theories, the mathematical, medical, and physical-philosophical, each within a larger framework of assumptions. Hunayn's theory is regarded in the medical tradition, quite evidently influenced by Galen's writings of almost seven centuries earlier.

Needless, to say, those of us who are biased by current theory of vision reinforced by a half millenium of post-renaissance scientific research will find this document difficult to read. It might well be easier for a mentally competent twelve year old with a tabula rasa mind not yet confronted with a complex network of scientific facts. This may be apparent from a single brief passage cited from Hunayn, as follows, ". . . when one shuts one eye, the pupil of the other one becomes enlarged, and when the closed eye is opened the pupillary hole of the other eye returns to normal size. This is clear proof that this enlargement is caused by the uvea when it is distended by the filling up of the place behind and inside it."

Eastwood also comments at some length on Hunayn's description of three alternative theories of the visual process, intromission, extramission, and the pneumatic medium. In the first the object sends signals to the eye. In the second the faculty of perception extends out from us to the object. The third theory, favored by Hunayn, postulates a mysterious transmitting "pneumatic" medium in the space between the eye and the objects seen.

These also illustrate the frustrating analyses that intelligent persons of the era had to resort to with the paucity of scientific data to guide them. Unappreciative of the immensity of his factual limitations, however, Hunayn described his "Ten Treatises" as "a book containing all the knowledge necessary for those who wish to treat the diseases occurring in the eye in a reasonable manner."

H.W H.

Optometric examination trends:

As the 1985 Owen Aves Memorial Lecturer Professor G. M. Dunn showed frequency distribution histograms of the duration of routine clinical examinations among United Kingdom optometrists in 1954-55, 1964-65, 1974-75, and 1984-85. The first three show essentially normal distributions with the mean of each at about 43 minutes. The fourth and most recent one, however, shows a startlingly distinct bimodality with peaks at about 16 and 43 minutes and an overall mean near 38 minutes. Supplementary analyses show comparable trends in percent of examined children under nine years of age and in per cent of domiciliary services, a significant drop in both in 1984-85.

The lecture is reproduced in the February 1, 1986, issue of Optometry Today (London), Vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 64-66.

Contact lens history:

"An Industry Profile, Father of the RGP Lens" is an historical comentary by Patty Sposato describing the role of Leonard Seidner, O.D., and his engineer brother Joe Seidner as contact lens manufacturing and design pioneers. Theirs was the sixth contact lens laboratory in the U.S.A., started in the early 1950's. Their research and development involved both rigid and soft gas permeable lenses. The article appeared in the March 1986 issue of Contact Lens Spectrum, Vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 50-52.

To now from 1629:

Does your professional vocabulary include such terms as Livery, Livery Company, Liverymen, Freeman, Freedom, Court of Assistants, Masters, Mastership, Warden, Upper Warden, Renter Warden, Sheriff, Clerk, mace and Company seals, insignia, and coats of arms? If so, it is probably because you are a Freeman of the Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers, usually abbreviated S.M.C., and enjoy at least a spiritual if not in fact an organizational tie with what is surely the longest unbroken ophthalmic optical continuum in the world. The rest of us may hear or read items about the S.M.C. and presume that knowledge of its inner functions, while not secret, is more or less to be regarded courteously as a bit privileged.

I am reminded of an analagous experience of my own many years ago when, as a naive American guest, I was seated next to Lady Janner at a formal banquet in London. After considerable small talk and pleasantries I mustered enough courage to ask apologetically but desperately the audacious question, "would you mind explaining to simple me just how one becomes a Lady?" "Not at all," she replied most graciously, "one merely marries a Knight."

I had read Frank Law's history of the S.M.C., but it, too, is completely understandable only to persons who already are familiar with its internal mechanism and who know an Upper Warden from a Liveryman, for example, which I do not.

In the latter part of 1985 I received from an English ophthalmic optician who had retired in Florida, U.S.A., a memo referring to an S.M.C. newsletter. The memo was accompanied by a sample page which included the statement that it was "published for private circulation to Freemen of the Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers". As editor of the N.O.H.S. I envisioned this as a possible pipeline to three and a half centuries of optometric history. I immediately checked the Indiana University Library, the International Library, Archives, and Museum of Optometry, the Union List of Serial Publications, the Visual Science Union List, and national and international serials directories, all with no success. So, once again desperately, audaciously, apologetically, and naively, I wrote to "The Clerk" of the S.M.C. to ascertain how we of other lands might gain easier access to this source of cultural enrichment.

A prompt reply from Clerk Colin J. Eldridge informed me that he forwarded my letter to the Editor of From the Master and Wardens, the title of the aforementioned newsletter, and that either one or the other would be replying

in due time with more details. About two months later Mr. Eldridge wrote me again to explain that the delay was due to consideration of my letter by the Master and Wardens at their recent meeting. For my information he enclosed the last two issues of From the Master and Wardens, No. 1, May 1985, and no. 2, November 1985, vol. 2. The numbering and dates suggest that the publication was started in 1984 and that it appears twice a year. The name of the editor is not given. Mr. Eldridge explained that it "really is a newsy letter to keep our own members up to date" and that its historical significance is probably limited.

The magazine is attractively printed on heavy glossy paper, about 20 pages in each issue and 30 x 21 cm in size. Included are several high quality photocopies of persons, places, events, and things as well as numerous obituaries, several biographical notes about persons past and present, and some unusual bits of historical information about spectacle makers tokens, artificial eyes, antique spectacles, relationships of the S.M.C. to other guilds, and familiar verbal expressions. Other items include diaries of coming events, personal reminiscences, and even an editorial assertion that the "... Livery includes ophthalmic surgeons, ophthalmic opticians or optometrists, dispensing opticians, members of the optical industry, scientists and businessmen, and a fair sprinkling of other professions".

Altogether From the Master and Wardens gives literary permanency to numerous optometric details that by and large are neglected by other serials but which quickly if not immediately become of historical resource value.

H.W H.

James Powell Cooke Southall, 1871-1962

For several decades the book "Mirrors, Prisms, and Lenses" by Southall represented to practically all American optometry students the first textbook introduction to the optometry curriculum. It was the bible for geometric optics not only in the opening course but also for the state board examinations following graduation. Its extremely formal style combined with the almost total newness if not strangeness and hurdlesome nature of the topic in the curricular sequence hardly won for its author any feeling of brotherly intimacy on the part of the students, only awe and respect. The fact that his administrative assignments on the physics faculty of Columbia University included the directing of its optometry courses for a quarter of a century seems merely to have reinforced this formally structured relationship. His translation of the Helmholtz volumes of physiological optics and his numerous other highly technical contributions served to document optometry's scientific infrastructure most admirably, but it was adequately appreciated almost only by the very few students and scholars who devoted their attention primarily to the fundamental rather than to the clinically applied phases of our discipline. In other words, we routinely thought of him as an optical physicist rather than an optometrist. By the same token one can wonder if his physics colleagues identified him more with optometry than with physics.

One more point worth making is the fact that Southall lived for 22 years, a full generation, beyond his academic retirement and virtual separation from his optometry-related career. He outlived most of his contemporaries and became personally quite unknown to the younger group. For example, though I

was 48 years old when he died, I had never had the opportunity to meet him nor to have correspondence with him even though we had many consecutive career features in common.

Such circumstances must explain in part why his optometric obituary of only two brief paragraphs, five sentences, appeared five months after his death in the Journal of the American Optometric Association, Vol. 34, no. 7, February 1963, p. 581. An almost as brief obituary appeared later in the February 1964 issue of the Journal of the Optical Society of America, Vol. 54, no. 2, p. 288. Both were anonymously written. Gratifyingly more respectful of Southall's role in society were the immediate news items in the August 25, 1962, issues of The New York Times and the Herald Tribune, the former of eight column inches and the latter of seven and a half inches.

Other sources of information are the 1950-51 and numerous previous editions of Who's Who in America. These of course have the reliability of having been prepared by the biographee himself but they lack the personal touch that might have been provided by a friend, a colleague, or even a neighbor. So now most of us know little about Southall's personality, his social talents, his philosophy, his community involvements, and the like. Was he witty, somber, polite, rude, considerate, generous, compassionate, supportive, demanding, etc., etc.? One can only guess such details, but the following condensed summary of his career does convey at least traces of his nature.

Born on April 4, 1871, in Norfolk, Virginia, he attended McGuire's School and Richmond College in Richmond, Virginia, and later the University of Virginia in Charlottesville where he earned the B.A. (1891) and M.A. (1893) degrees. During 1890-91 he was a teacher at McGuire's school, and during 1891-93 he was a physics instructor at the University of Virginia. During his time of graduate study he became a founding member of the Tilka Society, an honorary group dedicated to the ideals of the university. From 1893 to 1898 he was a professor of physics and mathematics at Miller Manual Training School of Albemarle, Virginia. Briefly in 1898 he was a Fellow at Johns Hopkins University. For the period of 1899-1901 he was Prendergast Professor of Physics at Hobart College, Geneva, New York, during which time he married Miss Jeannie Oliver Abbot. For the next 13 years he was Professor of Physics at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Alabama. In 1914, at the age of 43, he took the position of Assistant Professor of Physics at Columbia University, New York City, where he was subsequently promoted through academic ranks to full Professor in 1922. During all of his years at Columbia he was in administrative charge of the courses in optometry. Except for a summer at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1917 he remained at Columbia until his retirement on September 30, 1940, to Professor Emeritus status.

When his pursuit of optics began is not clear from the information now readily available to me. It does seem that it must have preceded his appointment at Columbia University, for on what other basis would he have been put in charge of the optometry courses? The cumulative index of the first 40 volumes of the Journal of the Optical Society of America show a list of 25 articles identified with his name, starting with a "focal length" article in 1920 and ending with his review of a German optics book in 1931. These include his books on geometric and physiologic optics as well as his Helmholtz translations. He served a term as president of the Optical Society of America. After retirement, in Charlottesville, Virginia, he wrote two books of memoirs, "In the Days of My Youth" and "The Abbots of Old Bellevue". In his "Who's Who" entry he listed membership in numerous optical, scientific,

historical, and honorary societies, including the Epsilon Psi Epsilon optometry fraternity. In retirement he donated many books and papers to the University of Virginia library, including a bound volume of daily newspaper reports of the Civil War.

Mrs. Southall died in 1951 and Professor Southall died on August 23, 1962, in Bronxville, New York, survived by a son Abbot Southall and three grandchildren. It is believed that Mrs. Abbot Southall is presently living in Bronxville, New York.

H.W H.

The archivist's dilemma:

Destruction of records of potential research value is an extremely sensitive matter. No one can predict accurately the nature and information needs of future researchers. Such developments as machine-readable records can change the demands of future researchers.

The archivist, whose obligation is to preserve and make available required documentation, not interpret it, must, in his (meaning his or her) decision-making process, consider both the physical limitation of source material and the nature of research interest. In terms of the former, hit (he or she) must consider such factors as duplication elsewhere, completeness, adequacy of summaries, repetition patterns, the potential interest groups, the physical facilitation of the documentation, its organization, indexing, and confidentiality. In terms of the latter the archivist must have a grasp of the nature of relevant research interests, as may be gained by participating in academic, historical, genealogical, and other special groups which depend on archival documentation. Hit must also follow trends of utilization of newly developed researchers' tools and record-scanning techniques.

A critical aspect of archival decision making is what may be called sampling, a technique of selection of parts of the whole sufficient to permit inferences to be drawn concerning the nature of the whole. By inadequacy of sampling the archivist can inadvertently (or intentionally!) influence interpretation, professionally not hit's privilege.

More critical is the likely error of the uninitiated owner of potentially archival material who attempts to dispose of "useless" items before donating his holdings to a museum or archival center. Only yesterday I saw a glass milk bottle in a neighbor's trash heap. Less than a lifetime ago glass milk bottles outnumbered people. Today it is difficult even to find one in a museum to show one's grandchild.

Optometry, in the sense of "sight-testing, prescribing, and fitting," has been an important part of social culture for more than three and a half centuries, nearly seven centuries in terms of "spectaclemaking", but can we reconstruct a reasonably clear image of our presence before 1900? In fact, is not even the image of our profession prior to World War II quite hazy?

Indeed, the archivist's role is critical to our accurate memory.

H.W H.

Henry W Hofstetter
Douglas K. Penisten, Editors