

Swiss Doctor Battles Old Age

Have you noticed how long many elderly men and women remain active in public life these days and still appear to retain astonishing vitality, both physical and mental?

The reason, in a number of cases, may well be glandular treatment. For scientists the world over are today experimenting with what is thought to be an all-important source for renewing human vigor.

While not the "Elixir of Life," as the "Fountain of Youth," which man has sought for centuries, it does seem to fight off the penalties of advancing years in a most extraordinary way.

The facts are, however, hard to prove because they depend so much on a lengthy passage of time, and also because few people like admitting that they have undergone a rejuvenating course!

But there is no doubt that Dr. Paul Niehans, the Swiss expert who specializes in giving fresh gusto to wealthy patients, has had some phenomenal successes.

And he is not alone. . . . Recently, he was invited to Moscow, where the Russians are also doing advanced work on the renewal of human body cells to give vitality. They believe that Dr. Serge Voronoff, who was scooped at forty years ago, was on the right track when he announced his monkey gland treatment for prolonging human life.

It is said that several of the world's leaders have visited Dr. Niehans in private when on official business in Switzerland. His comfortable clinic is set in beautiful grounds near Montreux—overlooking Lake Geneva.

Dr. Niehans has his own guinea-pig, and is his own best advertisement. At eighty, he looks about fifty-eight, tall, straight and brimful of energy, with smiling, rubicund face, keen blue eyes and grey hair and moustache.

The pretty, blonde English girl, Constance Marsh, from Reigate, Surrey, whom he married in 1923, is now in her late sixties, but could easily pass as forty.

For more than thirty years, Switzerland's Peter Pan has been pioneering in "cellular therapy." Although he also supplies dried hormones, he prefers to use living cells.

For instance, a ewe is painlessly killed, the unborn lamb taken from its body and promptly dissected. Hormones are extracted from its still warm heart, brain, liver, glands, kidneys, eyes and gall bladder.

These are placed in separate jars containing a saline solution which keeps them alive.

They can then be injected into a patient according to his or her physical failing, with the idea of what Dr. Niehans calls "correcting premature old age."

"I try," he says, "to bring fresh strength to the body by revitalizing the sex glands and make all the parts struck by old age capable of functioning properly once more."

If a human gland isn't working correctly, he injects cells from that particular gland of a healthy young or unborn animal. The idea is that the new living cells — say, from the liver — will combine or "home on" the human ones and stimulate them into full life, making the liver — in this instance — do its job effectively again.

Thus, the cells of one slaughtered animal may soon be circulating in the bloodstream of some fifty sick or elderly people!

But restoring degenerated human organs to full health can prove an expensive business, costing anything up to \$1,000.

Says the famous British author, Somerset Maugham, who is now eighty-eight and still going strong: "I owe my life to Niehans."

The Duke of Sutherland, who is seventy-four, was another visitor to the Swiss clinic; and youthful-looking film and TV star Bob Cummings recently spent several days with Dr. Niehans.

Other patients have included Gloria Swanson and the Hindu dancer, Ram Gopal. In 1933, Dr. Niehans treated Pope Pius XII, whose life has been despaired of. The Pope lived on for another four years, dying of a heart attack when he was eighty-two.

It is believed that Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the "Iron Chancellor," who at eighty-six still rules West Germany, has had similar treatment, but using dehydrated or deep-frozen cells. A physician writes Basil Bailey in "Tit-Bits":

In Great Britain, a recent law forbade the sale, without a doctor's certificate, of hormones — the substances produced in various glands and which can now be obtained by man-made means. The uncontrolled use of dehydrated cells, such as from the thyroid gland, had led to some alarming fatalities.

But insulin, one of the first hormones to be discovered, has, of course, proved of tremendous value in prolonging the life of diabetics.

Even so, the science is still in its infancy and great care has to be exercised. Not long ago synthetic hormones were used to fatten cattle and it was feared that there was a danger to the public.

A London pharmacist, whose firm sells a tonic still allowed on the open market because it made up of a mixture of dried, frozen and partly reconstituted portions of fish in the centre of each plate. Cook fish with crisp lettuce leaves. Surrounding the remaining chopped herbs. Around the edge of each plate arrange cucumber slices and tomato wedges. Garnish with sprigs of parsley and mint, if desired. Makes 4 servings.

TABLE TALKS

by Jane Andrews

Fish, apart from a few canned varieties, are seldom associated with salads. Yet the combination of tender, freshly cooked fish, tangy dressing, and crisp salad vegetables is a delicious one. Excuse me, one of the world's great chefs, knew this and the home economists of Canada's Department of Fisheries say that their experimental cookery has convinced them of it. They offer the following helpful hints on preparing fish for use in salads:

Cook and chill the fish as shortly before serving time as is convenient.

Good ways to cook fish which you plan to serve cold are: baking in a covering of aluminum foil, steaming, and poaching.

Accent the delicate flavour of cooked, chilled fish by liberal use of salt, lemon juice, and fresh garden herbs.

The following easy recipe points up the effectiveness of these techniques.

MINT AND PARSLEY FISH SALAD

1 pound fish fillets, cooked and flaked
1/2 teaspoon salt
1/2 teaspoon pepper
2 tablespoons lemon juice
2 tablespoons chopped mint
2 tablespoons chopped parsley
Lettuce
1/2 cup mayonnaise
Cucumber slices
Tomato wedges

Flake fish, season with salt and pepper, and sprinkle with lemon juice. Add herbs, reserving 2 tablespoons lemon juice and mint for use as a garnish. Combine fish and herbs. Chill well. Line four serving plates with crisp lettuce leaves. Mound equal portions of fish in the centre of each plate. Coat fish with mayonnaise and sprinkle with remaining chopped herbs. Around the edge of each plate arrange cucumber slices and tomato wedges. Garnish with sprigs of parsley and mint, if desired. Makes 4 servings.

Tomato aspic has long been a popular accompaniment to serve with meat and fish. Here is an attractive new two-layer molded salad which has a top layer of meaty, white halibut encased in clear lemon aspic, and as bottom layer, bright tomato aspic. A refreshing salad dish for a warm day, and one which is not high in calories!

HALIBUT-TOMATO ASPIC

Halibut Layer:
1 envelope unflavored gelatin
1/2 cup cold water
1 cup boiling water
1 tablespoon sugar
1/2 teaspoon salt
1/2 cup cooked lemon juice
3 tablespoons lemon juice
1/2 cup cooked or canned peas
Tomato Aspic Layer:
4 cups tomato juice
1/2 cup chopped onion
1/2 cup chopped celery leaves
1 teaspoon salt
2 small bay leaves
4 whole cloves
2 tablespoons unflavored gelatin
2 tablespoons lemon juice
1 cup finely chopped celery
Halibut Layer: Cut halibut into about 8 pieces, discarding any skin and bone. Soften gelatin in cold water. Dissolve in boiling water. Add sugar, salt, and lemon juice. Pour half of mixture into a lightly oiled, 2-quart mold. Quick chill in freezer or refrigerator until almost set. Place halibut pieces and peas on jelly in an attractive dish and press in lightly. Chill until firm.

Tomato Aspic Layer: Combine tomato juice, onion, celery leaves, salt, bay leaves and cloves. Simmer 5 minutes; strain. Soften gelatin in cold water; dissolve in hot tomato mixture. Add lemon juice. Chill until partially set. Fold in celery. Spoon over firm halibut layer. Chill until set. Unmold on serving platter. Deviled eggs on crisp lettuce make a pleasing garnish. Makes 8 servings.

TANGY TUNA TOSS-UPS

A handsome, hearty, crisp, bowl salad is very inviting this time of year. Tossing crisp and



pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

A fancy garnish adds to the enjoyment of many foods. Fish fillets, for example, acquire easy elegance when sauced and garnished with succulent, seedless green grapes. In France, where this combination originated, it is called Filets Veronique. Though extolled by gourmets, Filets Veronique is an easy dish to make.

FILLETS VERONIQUE

1 pound fish fillets
1/2 cup chopped onion
2 tablespoons melted butter
1/2 teaspoon salt
1/2 teaspoon pepper
1/2 cup seedless green grapes
1 cup cold water

Separate fish fillets. If large, cut into four, serving-size portions. Using a large frying pan, cook onion in melted butter until tender. Lay fillets on top of sautéed onion and sprinkle with salt and pepper. Combine water and lemon juice, pour around fish. Cover pan with a circle of waxed paper cut to size and having a small hole cut in the center of it. Heat fish to simmering temperature, reduce heat, and poach gently for 5 to 10 minutes, or until fish will flake easily on testing with a fork. Meanwhile, in a small saucepan blend 1 tablespoon of melted butter and the flour. Add cream; cook and stir until smooth and thickened. Remove fish to a heated serving platter and keep warm. Cover grapes with boiling water and let stand for several minutes to heat thoroughly. Stir thick sauce into poaching liquid left in frying pan. Cook and stir until mixture is well blended. Spoon sauce over fish and garnish with heated grapes which have been drained thoroughly. Makes 4 servings.

TUNA-BACON TOSS

1 can (7 ounces) tuna
1 head lettuce
3 green onions, chopped
2 hard-cooked eggs, chopped
6 slices breakfast bacon
2 tablespoons vinegar
Drain tuna and break into chunks. Tear lettuce in bite-size

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

pieces into salad bowl. Add tuna, onion, and eggs. Pan fry bacon until crisp. Remove from pan and drain on absorbent paper. Add vinegar to fat in pan. Bring to boil. Pour over salad and toss lightly to mix. Crumble bacon over top of salad. Serve immediately. Makes 4 servings.

How To Make Kids Eat What They Don't Like

As any parent knows, no conversation is so impossible as that of the small child who has convinced himself that the only foods fit for consumption are tuna fish, hamburgers, and peanut butter and jelly sandwiches. In the current School Management magazine, Richard Flannery — who is to the dietitian what Ann Landers is to the love-love — confronts this problem.

"Question: Last month I introduced some new foods on our school menu. They didn't go over too well. Can you tell me how to introduce new foods so that they will be accepted?"

"Answer: I suggest that new foods be introduced by gradually changing the old food. For example, children like spaghetti and meat balls. The school has a surplus of cheese. On one occasion serve spaghetti and meat balls, then macaroni and meat balls, and finally macaroni and cheese.

"It might be that some of the food you introduce will under no circumstances, be acceptable to the children. Try a variation of appearance and taste. . . . This can be achieved by adding touches of red or green, such as sliced beets, parsley, watercress, or peas. Children are especially attracted by red or brown in food colors."

What happens when children are color-blind the columnist didn't say.

Q. I should like to know the proper approach to a friend who insists upon blotting her lips with my best linen napkins when dining in my home. This leaves a hard-to-remove red imprint on the material!

A. You can hardly speak to her about it. But in the future furnish paper napkins of attractive designs on the market, or get busy immediately after the meal with some lipstick remover.

Obey the traffic signs — they are placed there for YOUR SAFETY.

ISSUE 34 — 1962

hand, because the Indians had used red and yellow ochre for warpath cosmetics, and the history of this is exciting. True, we don't know much about it, but what the archaeologists have found is curious. Here in Maine our earliest population was what we call the "Paint People." They were some kind of forerunner of the savages found by the first white men who landed on the eastern shores of the continent. There must have been a lot of them. One of their oddities was an esoteric symbolism with red ochre, which they brought with great labor from far away to line their graves. We know they did this, if we don't know why, and because of this use of red ochre they became the "paint" people.

Do you suppose the habit of smearing the face with color, as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification, lawyers today go on year after year sticking gum seals on documents. This is that if the seal meant something as the Indians in our history, is a survival of this older custom? A transfer, somehow, of the paint fetish? Why should we, a more sophisticated people, regard this as odd? What about the natural seal? Just because the Indians used a seal was an accepted identification