# Cleveland Clinic Quarterly

Volume 29 APRIL 1962 No. 2

## REFLECTIONS CONCERNING THE RESEARCH DIVISION OF THE CLEVELAND CLINIC

IRVINE H. PAGE, M.D.
*Division of Research*

THE opening of the new chemical laboratories of the Research Division is, wisely, I think, being used as an occasion for reviewing where we have been and where we are going. Today's global cacophony makes it hard to hear what is going on, so we need an occasion such as this to think in perspective.

The Research Division as we now know it was started in 1945 under very difficult economic conditions. The war was not won and the building had stood in disrepair for some time. I must confess that when Dr. A. C. Corcoran and I first saw it, we nearly took the first train home to Indianapolis. I am glad we didn't.

The Division was set up with a singular plan. The patients were to be the focal point from which problems were to be drawn, and all we could muster of the varied disciplines of science were to be put in concert to solve these problems. Separate departments were deliberately not created in the hope that the investigators would center their attention on the solution of the problem at hand, rather than the more restricted concern for furtherance of departmental status. Cooperation was thus insured in a unique way up to, and sometimes including, personality clashes.

A research unit of this sort should, in our view, remain small. This permits a minimum of rules and regulations and committees. Thus, fully 90 per cent of the investigator's time was made available for investigation. Some think this is too much!

A major point of policy is that the program of research in the Division will continue, as it started, in the field of cardiovascular disease. Having worked very

hard for the past 17 years to establish a position in the field, and having developed investigators thoroughly proficient in it, I believe we could only lose by wandering into alien studies. We have been frank in saying to young investigators that this is no place for people not interested in cardiovascular disease. I think we have been right in this because even today there are few groups wholly dedicated to study of the heart and circulation, in contrast to neoplastic disease, for example, for which there are several large institutes.

The policies concerned with financial support have varied greatly over the years. At first, funds came wholly from the practice of medicine and surgery in the Clinic, but with time, more and more support has come from Government, the American Heart Association, and private individuals. Times have changed and it is no longer possible to conduct the work of the Division on Clinic funds alone.

We have all tried to keep administration as such to a minimum—not always with success, but certainly with better results than in many places where it has become as time consuming as the research work itself. Many will debate the value of having a director and an assistant director of research. On the one hand, the administrator of an industrial laboratory is visualized and, on the other, a German authoritarian Geheimrat or Russian Akademician who decides everything. Quite obviously most of our investigators would not like either extreme. But there is still a third extreme, and that is complete freedom without responsibility. I do not believe that scientists differ qualitatively from other intelligent human beings in needing some guide lines of responsibility and rules to ensure scientific excellence. We are not all geniuses who need no restrictions. Most of us are of relatively modest ability and have to work hard to keep from being average. The director, then, is one who tries to keep administrative peace, to keep research aligned to the problems of cardiovascular disease, and to explain the work to numerous visitors from far and wide. Above all, I think, his most important function is to participate actively in creative work that is under way. It is possible for him to work to some extent in the laboratory, but if he is to be available to solve administrative problems and to offer counsel to the investigators on scientific problems, this must have limitations. Without participation in the research, his position would rapidly become meaningless and might just as well be turned over to a good businessman.

There are two major areas of work and one that connects the two. These are hypertension, atherosclerosis, and neurochemistry. My study of hypertensive and atherosclerotic patients began 35 years ago, first in New York then Indianapolis and now Cleveland. I think we can fairly boast that there is no group of hypertensive patients in the world today that have been more carefully studied, treated, and followed. The study of the mechanisms of hypertension have quite naturally been our primary concern, hence the work on serotonin and angiotensin and the study of its mechanisms in dogs and rats, among other things. The work on atherosclerosis has ranged from participation in both a local and a national diet study to investigations into the intimate chemical mechanisms of atherosclerosis in animals. Neuro-

chemistry fits nicely between these two fields of endeavor. It is a field that has interested me almost from the beginning of my career. With more modern methods and more modern investigators it is moving at a quickening pace. Already it is clear that the dividends in this discipline will be highly rewarding.

I believe the Division's work is good, but we would like it to become better. We have now some laurels, but wreaths wither and die. Our problem is to get on with these urgent problems, not with just pedestrian research, but with work that is creative and original. It is so easy to become self-satisfied and authoritarian, and difficult to remain uncertain, restless, and insecure. When we give up the latter for the former we have sold our freedom for the certainty of a production line.

I think the scientific content of our work will be clear from the vignettes that follow. Each staff member has been asked to contribute thoughts on what he is doing. No attempt has been made to give detailed data, to be thorough, nor to allocate credit. Rather, the attempt is to convey an over-all idea of what is going on.