In 1928 he left New York to become the first director of the new Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago, where he remained until 1931. As director, his ideal was for visitors to leave the museum convinced that scientists did more to "transform the earth and mold institutions than Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon, and that history is made in the laboratory and workshop as well as on the battlefield."

In 1931, Kaempffert rejoined the *New York Times* as science editor, a post he occupied with high distinction until 12 days before his death. His subject matter was properly described to be "as wide as nature itself." It included discussions on the latest concepts of the origin of life, atomic energy, relativity, evolution, nutrition, antibiotics, industrial management, and the effect of dictatorship on scientific progress. He was a strong advocate for the mobilization of scientific research for peacetime, as well as military, goals and was one of the first to champion the organization of cancer research along the same lines as the research laboratories in our great industries.

In 1954, Kaempffert became the first newspaper science writer to receive the Kalinga prize, worth $2800, for which he was nominated by the British Association of Science Writers. A few weeks earlier, he had accepted for the *Times* a special award of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, which credited him with having "shaped profoundly his newspaper's contribution to medical reporting in the public interest." In June 1956, he was named a fellow in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Clarkson Polytechnic Institute conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of science in 1939. He was the author of six books on various aspects of science and served as editor of half a dozen other volumes of popular science, including some for children.

Kaempffert enjoyed telling groups of scientists that the chief function of the science writer was to "make science so clear that the scientists could understand it." He felt that science was "not the property of a learned class but the common possession of mankind." In the words of an editorial in his newspaper, "he had a curiosity that roamed the whole field of human knowledge. A man of strong opinions, he was nevertheless tolerant of all but quackery. His writing, direct and purposeful, was informative and influential. . . . His advice and views were widely sought by educators, by men of the laboratory and of industry."

Those of us who were his colleagues on the *Times* will remember him, as the *Times* editorial states, as a man "who was unpretentious despite his great talents and learning, who could listen well just as he could talk well . . . who worked to the age of seventy-nine with the same zest in search of truth as when he began his career of distinguished specialization more than half a century ago."

WILLIAM L. LAURENCE
New York Times, New York, N.Y.

George Gomori, Leading Histochemist

On 28 February 1957, in Palo Alto, California, George Gomori died suddenly, with symptoms suggestive of coronary thrombosis. Only last October he had moved from the University of Chicago to the Palo Alto Clinic, in order to be nearer to his daughter and grandchildren, and was still in the process of organizing his schedule to resume his investigative work.

Born in 1904 and educated in pathology and surgery at the University of Budapest, Gomori was regarded as being primarily a pathologist, but the bulk of his published works were in histochemistry and histologic staining procedures. His work on the demonstration of the activity of the phosphatases in tissue sections literally initiated a new epoch in morphologic investigation. He and others have extended the basic principles of this work to localize various specific alkaline and acid phosphatases, phosphamidases, lipases, and esterases. He even, on at least one occasion, left the hydrolytic enzymes to extend his investigations to the leucocyte oxidases.

His histochemical work was by no means limited to enzyme localization. His work on enterochromaffin helped to break down the long-held doctrine that this substance was a catechol derivative, and he indicated in his last paper that his own resorcinol hypothesis is perhaps equally tenable with the presently popular serotonin theory, or that perhaps it represents a still unknown substance which differs from both.

Among his more strictly histologic methods, his aldehyde fuchsin procedure has achieved wide usage empirically, and many have attempted to use it as a histochemical procedure. He himself stated that he did not understand its mode of action. This method and his chrome alum hematoxylin method have proved widely useful in identification of pancreatic islet cells in the study of diabetes.

His work on the hydrolytic enzymes has gained world-wide recognition, and he is at this time regarded as having been one of the leading histochemists of the world.

He participated in 1950 in the organization of the Histochemical Society, served on its first council, was its vice president in 1956, and had been elected its president for 1957. He served as associate editor of the *Journal of Histochemistry and Cytochemistry* and of the *American Journal of Clinical Pathology.*

His book, *Microscopic Histochemistry,* though less extensive than its contemporaries, is a model of conciseness and accuracy and has achieved a wide usage.

R. D. LILLIE
National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland