An era is ended. Percival Bailey is dead. Never again can there be a man of such catholic interests. He was truly a renaissance man in the broad fields of neurology. Percival Bailey was a neuroanatomist, a neuropathologist, a neurophysiologist, a clinical neurologist, a neurosurgeon, and a psychiatrist. This was possible for him but not for his present-day successors. Bailey lived and worked in the period before cerebral angiography, radioactive brain scanning, the cathode ray oscilloscope, the image intensifier with its television monitor, the electroencephalograph, the electromyograph, the electron microscope, and the broad advances in the understanding and therapy of the nervous system and its diseases which have taken place in the past 20 years. He saw medical neurology threatened with extinction during the 1930's and 40's. Although he witnessed its later vigorous revival beginning in the 1950's, he did not participate in it. His interest by then had shifted to trying to save psychiatry from the nonscientific psychoanalysts who had pre-empted it, and had stymied scientific thought in that field.

Percival Bailey was more than just a man of science. He was also a humanist. A master of the English language, he read widely and interested himself in literature and history, particularly, because of his wife's background, in the history of the Armenian peoples. He was a superb teacher, a stimulator, and a gadfly. He was also an outstanding statesman in the health field.

That this would be his future could certainly not have been predicted of Percival Sylvester Bailey during his boyhood in "Little Egypt." He was born of poor parents on the eroded, barren soil of this neglected section of southern Illinois lying between the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. Do not look in the genealogies of the Baileys for his ancestors, for his name was not Bailey. His great grandfather had migrated to our shores from Germany with the name of Gebhard Boehler. As the name "Boehler" lay awkwardly on the Anglo-Saxon tongues of Little Egypt, he changed it to Bailey. Dr. Bailey was not happy with the given names which his loving mother had bestowed upon him. Both Percival and Sylvester were so distasteful to him that in his early years he went under the name "Ves." And in later years he wrote of his boyhood using that name. To most of his close friends, however, he was and always will be "Percy."

Bailey's parental home was an unhappy one. His drunken father deserted his family for a time, and when he was present the home was one of turmoil. His tender mother he loved but she died when Percy was 20. She, however, had by then succeeded in molding the kindly, considerate man who was Percival Bailey. Thereafter several
women greatly influenced Bailey's development and his career. These included Martha Buck, who taught grammar and rhetoric at Southern Illinois Normal School at Carbondale, Illinois, where Bailey began his college education, and Ethel Terry, a teacher of organic chemistry at the University of Chicago, where he completed his academic training. Most important of all women in his life was Yevnige Bashian, who became his wife. She was a beautiful, intelligent, talented young woman. During his active years she was his beloved, close companion and in his declining years one of the most devoted, attentive wives this world has ever known. It was these women who urged and prodded this man of superior intelligence to gain the education and training that enabled him to become the man we all knew, respected, and admired.

To those who would understand and appreciate his life and progress I commend his unusually frank, and at times ribald, book, *Up From Little Egypt*. Although this book is autobiographical, it is not an autobiography. It is composed of significant bits and pieces of his life. Unfortunately, one important chapter is missing, his recital of his experiences with Harvey Cushing. But of that, more later.

From the outset Bailey's interest was the nervous system in its broadest connotations. He proceeded to equip himself to master this field through the widest possible education and experience. He began at the beginning, in embryology, with George W. Bartelmez at the University of Chicago. In addition to being an outstanding embryologist and experimental endocrinologist, Bartelmez was a most meticulous investigator and writer of scientific papers. Bailey emulated this professor in his precision and honesty for the rest of his life. Training in neuroanatomy under one of the greatest of all comparative neurologists, Charles Judson Herrick, soon followed. In succeeding years he learned neuropathology seated at the microscope beside George Boris Hassin, neurophysiology with the distinguished Belgian, Frederic Bremer, and the Dutchman, J. G. Dusser de Barenne, and human neurophysiology with the German, Otfrid Foerster. In neurosurgery his master was Harvey Cushing, in neurology, Pierre Marie...
of France, and in psychiatry, Pierre Janet, Henri Claude, and Gaetan Gatian de Clérambault, also of France.

Did he pursue all of these varied neurological byways? He did! And thus we find among his papers studies of the morphogenesis of the choroid plexus, the cytology of the hypophysis and the pineal body, the cytoarchitecture of the cerebral cortex, the pia-glial membrane, and his greatest contribution, *A Classification of the Tumors of the Glioma Group on a Histogenetic Basis with a Correlated Study of Prognosis*. He also wrote about brain tumors and other pathological subjects, experimental studies on diabetes insipidus and adiposogenital dystrophy, the function of the hypophysis, the cortical representation of the vagus, the oxytocic substance in the cerebrospinal fluid, the sensory cortex of the chimpanzee, and the representation of respiration, blood pressure, and gastric motility on the orbital surface of the frontal lobe. In the field of medical neurology he discussed muscular dystrophy, subacute combined degeneration of the spinal cord, ideomotor apraxia, the reflexes in the upper extremity, and, later on, the training of the neurologist and the "Present State of American Neurology."

His books on neurological surgery include *Intracranial Tumors*, which was translated into several languages, and *Intracranial Tumors of Infancy and Childhood* (with Buchanan and Bucy) which has gone through several reprints. He also coauthored with Professor Georg Schaltenbrand the classical three-volume work, including an atlas, on stereotaxis of the human brain. Although there were scattered early papers dealing with psychiatry, his deep involvement in that field began with the publication in 1956 of *The Great Psychiatric Revolution* and culminated in *Sigmund, the Unserene*. This book, which clearly established the unscientific nature of psychoanalysis and the inconstancy and contradictory character of Freud, was translated into French with the title, *Sigmund, le Tourmenté*, which I prefer. In addition to his writings, Bailey served from 1946 to 1956 as the editor of the neurosurgical section of the *Yearbook of Neurology, Psychiatry and Neurosurgery*.

Dr. Bailey obtained his basic clinical medical education at both the University of Chicago (Rush Medical College) and Northwestern University Medical School where he was at the same time teaching anatomy. Because of this division of his medical education between two institutions, Bailey was unable to comply with the requirements for graduation at either; both schools had a stipulation that the last 2 years of medical school must be spent in that institution. The University of Chicago unwisely denied him the M.D. degree, thus excluding one of the world's most distinguished physicians from its alumni. Northwestern was wiser, and although Bailey had spent only one year of his entire education at that institution, they granted him the M.D. degree. The following day the University of Chicago conferred a Ph.D. upon him.

While serving his internship at the Mercy Hospital in Chicago (see Sister Ethelrita in *Up From Little Egypt*) he gave consideration as to how he might best extend his knowledge of the nervous system by acquiring specialized clinical training. He wrote two letters, one to Harvey Cushing, and one to Adolf Meyer. Cushing, showing the prompt decision typical of a surgeon, replied immediately; Meyer only after several months. As a result, Bailey became a neurosurgeon and not a psychiatrist. Again, we in neurosurgery have something for which to thank Harvey Cushing. During his internship, which Bailey regarded as largely a waste of time, he did get his first taste of clinical neurology. He worked outside of Mercy Hospital with one of Chicago's most distinguished neurologists, Julius Grinker, the father of Roy R. Grinker. Julius was the able but tyrannical, hypercritical, and cynical author of the section on neurology in the first edition of Tice's *Practice of Medicine*.

In April, 1919, Percival Bailey became an assistant resident surgeon at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston under Cushing. As Bailey has said many times, he found Cushing hard to take. He could stand him for so long and then he would have to be off for a few months or a year, only to return for another period. Bailey was often critical of Cushing, not as a surgeon, a teacher, or a scientist, but as a man. His
feelings about and evaluation of Cushing have been set down in a paper entitled, "Pepper Pot" which was delivered before the Chicago Literary Club. It has also been read privately to groups of friends and young neurosurgeons on several occasions, but unfortunately it has never been published.

Some have thought that Bailey disliked Cushing and did not appreciate Cushing's greatness. Nothing could be farther from the truth. On many occasions Bailey expressed his admiration for Cushing's accomplishments, but let us have him speak in his own words. This is what he had to say about Cushing:

“No less important than his contributions to medicine were the results of the impact of his personality on his numerous pupils. Wherever civilized medicine was practiced, his influence was felt. Pupils came to him in ever-increasing numbers. My own debt to him is incalculable. It would need a volume to discuss all the lessons he taught me, and all the others he tried to teach me which I did not grasp at the time. He was not an easy man to work with. We disagreed often, sometimes vigorously. When tension became too great I went away for a while. But I always came back. And when I did there were neither apologies nor reproaches on either side. We simply began again where we had left off. To account for these clashes would be to attempt an appraisal of the man and his work. This is not the time for such an attempt, were I presumptuous enough to undertake it.” But eventually he did undertake it in “Pepper Pot.” During his time with Cushing, “off and on” from 1919 to 1928, Bailey learned neurological surgery and also applied his knowledge of embryology, anatomy, and pathology in a study of the brain tumors in Cushing’s collection. Out of that study came his books, Tumors of the Glioma Group and Blood Vessel Tumors of the Brain.

It was during his “vacations” from Cushing that Bailey traveled first to Hassin in Chicago (1920) where he studied neuropathology and then to France where neurology and psychiatry were his concern. During these two periods in France, 1921-22 at the Salpêtrière in Paris with Pierre Marie, and 1925-26 at L’Hospice Ste. Anne with Henri Claude, and in the law courts of Paris with de Clérambault, he acquired a background in these areas of clinical medicine that greatly enriched his life. More important, however, he acquired a love for France and the French people. At the same time he learned to share with the French their distaste for the English. This never left him, although years later he did develop an admiration for Geoffrey Jefferson. Of course, he never considered his close friend, Norman Dott of Edinburgh, an Englishman.

In 1928 came the opportunity to strike out on his own, to leave Boston and to return to that university which he loved and admired the most, Chicago, where a new medical school was being formed with a completely full-time faculty. In making this move he had no misgivings, but his confidence was not shared by others. Cushing said: “I don’t know what is going to become of you. You will never be a neurosurgeon.” And Max Peet, when he learned of this appointment, said: “Why, Bailey is not a neurosurgeon. He’s a pathologist.” Bailey was to prove both of them wrong. He became a superb surgeon and made great contributions to neurological surgery. He was one of that group of men who came into neurosurgery through channels other than general surgery. They included Foerster, Vincent, and Horsley, and he was proud to be one of them. The fact is that, for Bailey’s taste, neurosurgery was too repetitive, too confining to his intellect. Once he had demonstrated to his own satisfaction that he could perform a given operation well, he had little interest in repeating it.

I had come to the University of Chicago with Bailey in 1928, and was his first resident, although organized residency training as it exists today was then unknown. Shortly after he arrived in Chicago he became desperately ill with the mumps. The onset was soon followed by the complications of orchitis, high fever, and delirium. As he was to say later, when he recovered from this rather protracted illness, “I found Bucy in charge. He had taken over the service.” From the first, our association was a very close and personal one. He was a second father, a teacher, an example, and,
above all, a guide in the paths of accurate scientific observation and investigation and in honesty. He always referred to me as his "first born." My debt to him, like my admiration for him, knows no bounds.

Bailey began his work at Chicago with great anticipation. Here was a new school with new ideas. Not only did it have the first completely full-time, fully salaried faculty, but it developed an unusual curriculum. The course of study for its students was founded upon several important pillars. The student body was unusual. They were selected because of their apparent interest in investigation and academic medicine. Many of them already had Ph.D.'s in various areas. Many were members of faculties in other institutions in the basic sciences. The faculty had their offices within the building which housed their laboratories and the hospital. They spent all of their time there, much of it with the students. The students were encouraged to engage in investigation. Clinical instruction was closely related to the patient. It was Osler's bedside teaching at its finest. Many members of the faculty had previously been engaged in teaching basic medical sciences. These men included Lester Dragstedt, who had been head of the Department of Physiology at Northwestern University; George Curtis, who had been a professor of anatomy; and Dallas Phemister, Head of the Department of Surgery, who was a world renowned authority on the pathology of bone tumors.

Bailey came to Chicago bubbling with energy and enthused with a new idea. He would develop at this new and progressive medical school a clinical department of neurology and neurological surgery which would actually be a Department of the Neurosciences. He was made Head of the Division of Neurology and Neurosurgery. He recruited into this division Roy R. Grinker, a very able young neurologist, who had been trained in neuropathology, and Stephen Poljak from the University of California, an experimental neuroanatomist who had just distinguished himself with the publication of a book, The Main Afferent Fiber Systems of the Cerebral Cortex in Primates. Bailey had visions of adding to his staff neurological clinicians, either neurologists or neurosurgeons, who had a background and special interest in neurophysiology, neurochemistry, and other neurosciences. The new medical school appeared to be the ideal place to do this. The University had long expressed its interest in a close correlation between basic biological science and clinical medicine, which explains the fact that this graduate program was not designated as part of the medical school, but rather as part of the Division of Biological Sciences. It had a distinguished faculty in the basic sciences, which included Bartelmez and Herrick, already mentioned; Robert Bensley, Head of the Department of Anatomy and an authority on the pancreas; Anton J. (Ajax) Carlson, the Head of the Department of Physiology; Arno Luckhardt, the discoverer of ethylene as an anesthetic agent and the father of modern anesthesiology; Nathaniel Kleitman, the authority on sleep; Ralph Gerard, one of the earliest electrophysiologists; Karl Lashley and Heinrich Klüver, outstanding experimental psychologists; Carl Moore, authority on the biology of reproduction; Warder Clyde Allee one of the world's first biological ecologists; Frederick Koch in biochemistry; H. G. Wells, the recognized authority on chemical pathology; not to mention the distinguished faculties with several Nobel laureates in chemistry and physics, and an outstanding array of men and women in the humanities.

Bailey not only envisioned a true Neurological Institute which would encompass all neurology but was encouraged by the Rockefeller Foundation which was prepared to support Bailey and largely finance such an institute. But Bailey's vision was not matched by those about him. A new "boy" president had just come to the University of Chicago, Robert Maynard Hutchins. Unfortunately for Bailey, Hutchins detested science, and medicine most of all. He once remarked that the only exposure to science that he had ever had was freshman chemistry in college; its laboratory smelled so badly that he dropped the course after a week and never returned to science again. But Hutchins was not the only barrier, simply the most important one. The others were Phemister, head of the Department of Surgery, George Frederick Dick, head of the Department of Medicine; and Frederick Schlutz,
head of the Department of Pediatrics. During Bailey's stay at Chicago he was refused a separate department. The Division of Neurology and Neurosurgery which had been created for him was under the heads of three departments—surgery, medicine, and pediatrics. These three men were not only great individualists but also very jealous of their own prerogatives and their departments. Furthermore, they could never agree among themselves. Thus, Bailey found his ambition for a Department of the Neurosciences completely frustrated. He could not organize and develop his Division because of the inability of the three chiefs to agree, nor could he have his own independent department because of them and the President of the University. The one man who shared and supported his vision was Franklin C. McLean who was largely responsible for the organization of the medical school in this new form. But he clashed with Phemister, and Phemister proved to be the more powerful. McLean was removed as Dean of the Division of Biological Sciences and as head of the Department of Medicine and relegated to the relatively unimportant position of professor, not head, in the Department of Physiology. After 11 years of struggle, Bailey surrendered. A disappointed and discouraged man, he resigned from the University. True, the loss was his, but in far greater measure the loss was that of the University of Chicago. It lost Bailey and it lost the opportunity to be the first university in this country to develop a true Department of the Neurosciences.

It should not be assumed that, because the period at the University of Chicago ended in grave disappointment, it was not a very happy, productive period. Quite the contrary. During this time he continued to elaborate on the pathology of brain tumors. He trained and influenced a number of young men who were later to become distinguished in neurological surgery. Probably the greatest of these was Professor Clovis Vincent and his two associates, Pierre Puech and Marcel David. Vincent had visited Cushing in 1927 and had become well acquainted with Bailey, who was the only person in Cushing's clinic who spoke French fluently. In 1929 when Vincent decided to become a neurosurgeon himself, he felt that he must first learn more about the details of American neurosurgery. In the fall of 1930 he returned to the United States with his two associates. They went directly to Bailey in Chicago, where they were known as the “three musketeers.” In Vincent's inaugural address on January 26, 1939, when he was elected the first Professor of Neurosurgery in France, he said, “Bailey is my friend. Because of him I have come to understand American neurosurgery; because of him I have become familiar with the successes and failures of American neurosurgery. It was possible, during my brief stay in Chicago, to put questions to him to which he responded conscientiously and graciously. He was a man who wished to teach. Bailey has been the means of the union between American neurosurgery and me.”

During this same period, Araki, Tanaka, and Shimizu came to Bailey from Japan and learned neurosurgery from him. These three men then returned to Japan where they in turn created modern Japanese neurosurgery. There were others from abroad, and a distinguished group of pupils from North America, including William Sweet of Boston and Ralph Cloward of Honolulu. Two others, A. Earl Walker (a Canadian) and Paul Bucy, became Presidents of the Society of Neurological Surgeons, the American Neurological Association, the American Association of Neurological Surgeons (then known as the Harvey Cushing Society), of the World Federation of Neurosurgical Societies, and of the International Congresses of Neurological Surgery.

While at Chicago, Bailey wrote his outstanding text, *Intracranial Tumors*, of which Clovis Vincent wrote: “He thinks French. One has only to realize this by reading his book on tumors of the brain. His book has a French clarity. I regret only that there is not a French edition.” He also joined with his *Bailey est mon ami. Grâce à lui, en quelque jours, j'ai compris le neurochirurgie américaine; grâce à lui, je n'en ai pas vu seulement le dessus, mais aussi les dessous. A lui, j'ai pu poser des questions auxquelles il a répondu avec conscience et amitié, comme quelqu'un qui veut vous apprendre quelque chose. On peut dire que Bailey a été le trait d'union entre la neurochirurgie américaine et moi.”—Clovis Vincent
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two associates, Douglas N. Buchanan and Bucy, in writing *Intracranial Tumors of Infancy and Childhood*.

In 1939, Bailey transferred to the University of Illinois as Professor of Neurology and Neurosurgery under Eric Oldberg. However, he had made up his mind that the battle was lost at Chicago about 1937. He recognized that the greatest deficiency in his own knowledge of neurology was in neurophysiology. During a sabbatical leave from Chicago he went to Belgium to work in physiology with his old friend of Boston days, Frederic Bremer, and then to Yale to work with J. G. Dusser de Barenne. When he came to the University of Illinois he began working intensely on the physiology of the cerebral cortex in primates, first with Warren G. McCulloch and Hugh Garol, and later with Ralph Gerard. This work on the physiology of the cortex raised serious doubts in his mind as to the accuracy of the cytoarchitecture of the cerebral cortex as described by the Vogts. As a result he began working on this with the neuroanatomist, Gerhard von Bonin. Out of their studies came a much sounder understanding of the cytoarchitectonics of the cerebral cortex of man and of monkey. He continued to work in his neuropathological laboratory and many students came from all over the world to work with him.

After a time, however, he concluded that he was merely “spinning his wheels.” He returned to his earlier love, psychiatry. In 1951 he became the Director of the Illinois State Psychiatric Institute, and Chairman of the Illinois Psychiatric Council. In this position he visited the various state hospitals for patients with mental disturbances and was the advisor to the Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, on matters of mental health. He soon became impressed with the lack of effective treatment of psychiatric problems and with the fact that the state hospitals were little more than domiciliary institutions. He determined to do something to correct this. He learned through some of his friends, who were more familiar with the State’s finances than he, that $8 million dollars lay in the State treasury untouched, unused. This was money which had accumulated over the years from the trivial amounts which some families had paid to the State of Illinois for the care of their relatives in the State mental hospitals. By law this money was restricted to be used only for the improvement of the care of those with mental illness. Over the years no one in Illinois could think of any way in which this could be accomplished. But Bailey did. He first convinced the governor to release this money for teaching and research. Bailey then created the Illinois State Psychiatric Training and Research Authority, of which he was named Executive Director. This Authority was designed along the lines of the National Institutes of Health. It was to award money in the State of Illinois for research projects and psychiatric training programs. It functioned well until an ambitious head of the Department of Mental Health in Illinois, an accountant by background, decided to seize control of this Authority himself. He did and its usefulness has disappeared.

Bailey also created the Illinois State Psychiatric Institute and designed and supervised the construction of a building in Chicago for 500 patients. This Institute was for the purposes of clinical research and training in psychiatry. Bailey proposed by these two instruments, the Authority and the Institute, to bring psychiatry back from the wilderness of words into which it had wandered, into the clear, cool light of scientific medicine. As at the University of Chicago, Bailey and his vision were ahead of their times. The failure of these two institutions to develop along the scientific lines he had hoped was Bailey’s second great disappointment. However, he did not surrender without one last telling blow. Recognizing that psychoanalysis was the factor preventing the scientific understanding of disorders of the mind and the emotions, he turned to the study of the man who started it. The result was his devastating book *Sigmund, the Unserene*. In this connection Bailey wrote:

> “My animus is not directed toward Freud. My animus is directed toward the overweening, hypertrophied and distorted influence which his movement has attained in these United States, as he foresaw and feared. In this way, it has, in my opinion, done great damage to psychiatry as well as to our civilization in general”...
“There is no conclusive evidence that, as a method of therapy, psychoanalysis is more effective than others, and it is costly beyond its merits; as a philosophy it is chaotic, contradictory and circular; as a science it is unestablished; and as a religion it is inadequate.”

For many of the later years of Bailey’s life he had been plagued by recurring bouts of high fever during which he became delirious at times. These never lasted for long; but their cause was never found and they were never successfully treated. He also lost useful vision in one eye. This greatly impaired his ability to continue his pathological studies. In 1967 the weather of Chicago took a bitter toll. Getting out of a taxi late in the morning he slipped on the ice, injured his hip, and struck his head; nevertheless he continued at his office. When he reached home late in the afternoon he had become so confused mentally that he could tell his wife Yevni6, nothing of what had happened or how he felt. She took him directly to the hospital. For days his physicians despaired. When, after about a week, he became coherent he complained of his hip. Only then was it discovered that he had impacted the head of his left femur into the acetabulum. By then he had developed a severe pyelonephritis and was in the early stages of uremia. He was far too ill to permit any attention to the fractured hip other than immobilization of the pelvis in a sling. For the rest of his life this hip was his greatest physical burden. It greatly impaired his ability to get about. At first he could only move around his own house with help from someone else, usually his wife. Later he mastered the use of two crutches. In spite of his inability to leave his home, except on rare brief trips, he continued alert and interested in everything. It was during this period that he compiled some of the papers which he had delivered before the Chicago Literary Club into a volume of autobiographical notes entitled, Up From Little Egypt.

To me Percival Bailey was a dear friend, a teacher, a counselor, and guide. I also found him to be a very complex man. This was accounted for only in part by the breadth of his knowledge and interests. He was kindly, liberal, and generous to a fault. As a result he was often put upon by others. Although he selected as his disciples and associates men who later became outstanding figures in their own right (Roy Grinker, Earl Walker, William Sweet, Chisato Araki, Kenji Tanaka, Adolfo Ley, Theophile Alajouanine, Georg Schaltenbrand, Norman Dott, Frederic Bremer, Clovis Vincent, Douglas Buchanan, Gerhard von Bonin, Arist Stender, Roman Arana, and others) he could at times be the poorest judge of men. On one occasion, in opposition to strong advice, he selected as his resident a man who subsequently became the most despicable knave that ever crossed the threshold of the University of Chicago. Because of his liberal tendencies he resigned from membership in the University Club of Chicago because of its restrictive membership requirements. He frequently was critical of the policies of the American Medical Association and was finally prevailed upon to become a member of the House of Delegates of that organization. However, after a brief exposure he concluded that there was nothing he could do to alter its policies and resigned. Because of his liberal views and his worldwide associations there were those in the Federal Administration (prior to Nixon) who declared him a risk to the Government of the United States. As a result he could never be confirmed for appointment to any of the study sections or advisory councils of the National Institutes of Health. Their information was bad and their evaluation of Bailey worse, for there was never any American more loyal to his country than he.

During his lifetime he received many honors from universities, societies, governments, and other organizations. These will not be listed here but all can be found in his book, Up From Little Egypt. Of all these, however, he was most appreciative and most proud when the University of Paris awarded him its degree, Docteur honoris causa, in 1949.

In June, 1973, he began to fail rapidly and on August 10, 1973, he died, having passed his 81st birthday on May 9.