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The challenge for educational institutions in a world struggling with the demands of a society ravaged by war and disease at the conclusion of the second decade of the 20th century, was global in nature and scope, namely to identify how to contribute to stabilizing and optimizing the social, political and economic infrastructure of civil society. Philanthropic foundations were uniquely positioned to assist in developing the social arrangements and institutions needed in charting new directions following this era of major social upheaval. As a critical and fundamental element in rebuilding society, health was an important area of philanthropic interest. Although medicine was the primary focus of the philanthropic foundations, nursing was also a significant field because of its centrality in public health and public health education programs. New hospitals and public health agencies were being established in great numbers throughout civil society in this era because of advances in medicine and technology. These new technologies and care were brought to people through the efforts of health professionals such as physicians and nurses who offered their services under the auspices of the developing health organizations. The interface between the educational institutions and philanthropic foundations was an important one in this era because private support allowed universities to experiment and innovate with philosophy and curriculum in order to produce graduates who were prepared at an advanced level to provide important health contributions in society. Anheier and Daly have pointed out in their conference paper that the development of the large philanthropic foundations such as Carnegie and Rockefeller in the United States was important in that they were interested in long term rather than short term solutions to problems in society.

The research reported in this paper relates to the development of education for public health nursing at the University of Toronto between after its courses began in 1920 made possible by a series of grants from the International Health Division of the Rockefeller Foundation. The collaboration between the Foundation and the School of Nursing at the University of Toronto was remarkable because it represented a convergence in thinking between
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the two organizations and allowed for innovation and experimentation with basic public health nursing education. The latter was based on a philosophy that preparation for public health nursing was of primary importance and required background in the humanities, arts and sciences that were best offered at the university level in a curriculum in which all aspects of nursing were studied. This was a radical departure from conventional thinking at the time when nurses were educated in hospital apprenticeship programs. Because service was the primary mission of the hospital, education was often secondary in the education of nursing students. The first programs in public health nursing developed in Canada were one-year certificate programs that were designed for graduates of hospital nursing programs. Historical methods were used to analyze the primary source documents pertaining to this research on the impact of Rockefeller grants on the development of one university school of nursing in Canada. The questions driving this research thus centred on the institutional support provided to the University of Toronto School of Nursing by the Rockefeller Foundation between 1920 and 1955 in terms of how the work proposed and carried out at the School of Nursing supported the aims and objectives of the organization during this period.

This research has considerable global importance in that the International Health Division saw the School of Nursing at the University of Toronto as a “lighthouse school” that would provide a model for emerging public health nursing programs in universities around the world. The University of Toronto was also used as the primary site for Rockefeller fellowship recipients because of its innovative approaches in nursing education and because students from varying racial backgrounds who could not be accommodated in university programs in the United States were accepted in its programs. This extended the reach and influence of the University of Toronto School of Nursing as when graduates returned to their own countries and became leaders in nursing and nursing education. This chapter in the history of public health nursing education tells the story of how an important collaboration between a philanthropic foundation and a university allowed an academic unit in nursing to experiment and innovate with curriculum models and at the same time advance the global objectives of the foundation in public health.
Global history as it pertains to civil society and the philanthropic foundations is a critical means of advancing understanding of the development of society and social institutions and provides a perspective for interpreting contemporary issues and processes.

The worldwide impetus for health promotion came in part from the significant numbers of men from all nations who had been assessed as unfit by virtue of health for military service and also the considerable losses of those who served in the war. Not insignificant were the ravages of a host of communicable diseases, including the Spanish influenza pandemic of 1917-18 with its global mortality figure estimated between 20 - 40 million. It was thus proposed that “a central organization . . . . stimulate and co-ordinate the voluntary efforts of the peoples of the world through their respective Red Cross Societies, which shall assist in promoting the development of sound measures for public health and sanitation, the welfare of children and mothers, the education and training of nurses, the control of tuberculosis, venereal diseases, malaria, and other infectious and preventable diseases.” Indeed, this international organization recognized that an emphasis on nursing education was vital as nurses could serve as key frontline workers in the effort to achieve every single one of its primary objectives.

In October, 1919 the Canadian Red Cross Society wrote to Sir Robert Falconer, President of the University of Toronto to determine its interest in establishing a course in public health nursing. In March 1920, Colonel George Nasmith, Executive Chairman of the Ontario Division of the Society offered financial support for the appointment of a director who would be a graduate nurse with university training in public health nursing. Expenses for the first three years of operation would be covered for the demonstration project, after which the University could decide whether or not to continue the course. President Falconer reported in a letter to Colonel Nasmith on May 15 that the Senate was pleased to accept the offer. The next step was to find a capable director for the program.

Born in Windsor, Nova Scotia, Edith Kathleen Russell was a brilliant student who earned the Governor General’s Gold Medal for the highest standing in the examination for degrees upon completion of her Bachelor of Arts degree at King’s College, Windsor, Nova Scotia in 1904.
She entered the University of Toronto and after two preparatory years was admitted to the third year of the Faculty of Medicine, one of seven women in a class of 158. Forced to withdraw when she contracted tuberculosis, Russell spent the next seven years recuperating at home in Nova Scotia. Faced with the prospect that “. . . her illness was considered to be incompatible with a career in Medicine.”\textsuperscript{vi}, Russell revised her goals and set her sights on nursing as a career. She entered the Toronto General Hospital School of Nursing in 1915, graduating in 1918 with the award for the highest academic standing. This earned her a scholarship for a one-year Social Service course at the University of Toronto that she completed in the Spring of 1919, whereupon she accepted a position with the Toronto Department of Public Health.\textsuperscript{vii} Under the leadership of the renowned Dr. Charles Hastings, the Department had achieved a great deal since his appointment as Medical Officer of Health in 1910. Dr. Hastings was also a member of the Senate of the University and supportive of the establishment of the Department of Public Health Nursing. In June, 1920, Kathleen Russell was appointed to the post of Director of the new Department of Public Health Nursing.\textsuperscript{viii}

The program in public health nursing offered by the fledgling Department of Public Health Nursing was immediately successful with 49 graduates in the 1920-21 course and 45 in the 1921-22 course. The University’s report to the Society stated expansively that: “. . . Toronto can take a leading place in the country in this piece of work. Our numbers for the last two years have nearly equalled the total enrolment of all the other Canadian universities. . . . A year spent at this university by a mature intelligent woman can mean a great deal.”\textsuperscript{ix} As the period of Red Cross funding drew to a close, the Ontario Division observed with satisfaction that the University had decided to take over financial responsibility for the Department of Public Health Nursing at the conclusion of the grant:\textsuperscript{x}

The Rockefeller Foundation was at the forefront of early developments in public health nursing. Recognizing the importance of public health and the role that nurses could play in health education, health promotion and prevention of disease, the Foundation convened a conference of those interested in the development of public health nursing in the U.S. in
December, 1918. The roster of invités read like a “who’s who” in health as the leaders in nursing, medicine and others involved in the field of public health were asked to attend. At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Rockefeller Foundation on March 20, 1919, it was agreed that

1. The public health nurse is an essential element in the development of public health throughout the world.
2. There is at present the widest divergence of opinion as to the proper training for this functionary.
3. It is generally felt that at present no set of training courses is entirely satisfactory.\textsuperscript{xii}

On the basis of this information and with George Vincent in the chair, a motion was passed to approve “a thorough study of the proper training of public health nurses” with a “willingness to consider an application for an appropriation to meet the expenses of such a study.”\textsuperscript{xiii} Those attending the original meeting and some others were invited for a second meeting in March, 1919, and would oversee the national survey conducted by Josephine Goldmark. Although originally the mandate of the investigation was limited to public health nursing, the scope of the study was expanded a year later to include hospital nursing since it was determined that the most appropriate way to educate public health nurses necessitated a study of the entire field.

The final Report supported university education in nursing stating “that the development and strengthening of University Schools of Nursing of a high grade for the training of leaders is of fundamental importance in the furtherance of nursing education.”\textsuperscript{xiv} In addressing the preparation of public health nurses, Goldmark concluded that public health nursing could not be separated from general nursing and thus public health nurses required preparation in both basic hospital nursing and public health nursing. The Goldmark Report became one of the most influential documents of its day and influenced events not only in the United States, but also in Canada and elsewhere for years to come.\textsuperscript{xv} As such, it became the cornerstone of the Foundation’s evolving policy in nursing education and public health.

The Foundation’s program of support for nursing education had to this point included development of a hospital diploma program in Brazil and a bifurcated program in France to
develop cadres of public health nurses and hospital nurses in that country. The latter was the idea of Elizabeth Crowell who was in charge of the nursing part of the Foundation’s campaign to combat tuberculosis in France. As the fundamental tenets of these schools were aimed at minimal rather than optimal preparation for general and public health nursing, as well as producing large number of graduates in the shortest possible time, they were in conflict with the principles outlined in the Goldmark Report. The appointment of Mary Beard as an Associate Director of the reorganized International Health Division with the same status as other officers of the International Health Division was a critical step in developing a new approach in the nursing program that would emphasize university level education for public health nursing.

Her appointment put nursing on a new footing within the organization and placed quality would be a fundamental principle in financing projects to experiment with new and innovative models for general and public health nursing education.

The chaotic situation that Kathleen Russell later described as a “Mad Hatter’s Tea Party”, referred to her view that nursing was floundering in a multitude of problems in the first part of the twentieth century, not the least of which was lack of quality in nursing services and deficiencies in educational standards in schools of nursing. Following termination of Red Cross funding, Russell began to develop a relationship with the Rockefeller Foundation and accepted nursing fellows sent by the Foundation to take the course she offered in public health nursing in Toronto. On October 23, 1928 she wrote to Beard to “ascertain whether or not the Foundation would be interested in helping to bring into being such a school, including its construction and maintenance.” In the proposal she forwarded with a proposed cost estimate of $550,000.00, she described that she envisioned the school as preparing teachers for hospital schools, public health training for graduates of hospital schools, and “a laboratory for study of the educational problems of nursing: to experiment with new courses by means of small, selected classes.

She requested that Beard “... come to Toronto to make a study of the conditions and the opportunities here for such a school.” The emphasis upon public health education, experimentation in new models of nursing education and a focus upon quality and small, selected
classes were clearly in concert with Foundation objectives. However, Russell must have been disappointed in Beard’s reply of October 31 stating that Dr. Pearce had requested that she “hold this material for the time being.”

In the meantime, in an evident effort to raise awareness of her colleagues of the work going on at Toronto, Beard described the history of the relationship with the Foundation in an internal memo on the status of the University of Toronto Department of Public Health Nursing in which she spoke glowingly of the work of the Department and its service to the nursing fellows sponsored by the Foundation:

Over a period of six years (1923 - 1929) 60 foreign fellows and 4 Americans took the course in public health nursing connected with the School of Hygiene and Public Health or to observe the work for various periods, for the reasons that follow: . . . an exceptional Director and the teachers associated with her.

She noted as well that: “Although no promise has ever been given that Rockefeller Foundation will help to establish progressive nurse education at Toronto University, yet there has from time to time been implications of such help through fellowships granted to nurse teachers.”

In this note she reminded her colleagues of the financing provided to other initiatives at the University of Toronto including $1,000,000 granted to the Medical School in 1921, $650,000 to the School of Hygiene and Public Health in 1924, $50,000 to the Institute for Child Study in the same year, and in 1929, $40,000 for research in the Department of Pediatrics.

Beard’s efforts to support the Toronto School’s cause amongst her colleagues evidently began to bear fruit, as on June 14, 1929, she invited Russell to develop a comprehensive proposal explaining that the: “officers of the Rockefeller Foundation have recently been giving thought and consideration to these plans . . . . this problem should be investigated more thoroughly and that consideration should be given to a more detailed and thoroughly worked out scheme.”

When Beard sent word that she would come to visit the Department of Public Health Nursing in view of a positive review of the proposal submitted to the Foundation, Russell wrote enthusiastically of proposed appointments with the President and medical leaders and appealed for at least a visit of at least two days as there was so much to discuss.
Following Beard’s site visit, Foundation officers were highly positive about the school:

At the University of Toronto excellent courses covering the preparation of public health nurses have been given for the past seven years. The quality of the instruction and the close co-operation for field training have led the officers of the Foundation to select this school for training a large number of its foreign fellowship holders in nursing. An undergraduate four-year course in preparation for public health nursing is already in progress.\textsuperscript{xviii}

The officers also endorsed her plan including the idea of an independent school affiliated with the University of Toronto and approved a commitment of not greater than $350,000.00 “toward the provision of teaching facilities in a School of Nursing in Toronto.”\textsuperscript{xviii} The internal memo circulated by Beard prior to the meeting for the consideration of the officers referred to three Foundation commitments to nursing education, namely at Yale, Vanderbilt and the University of Toronto.\textsuperscript{xxix}

Reporting on the result of efforts to secure a provincial commitment for a building that could be renovated to house the School, Russell described a slow, difficult process:

At last we have seen the Prime Minister,\textsuperscript{xxx} Mr. Ferguson, but only yesterday. Miss Gunn\textsuperscript{xxxi} and I saw him together, and in company with Sir Joseph Flavelle. And thereby hangs a very long tale. Sir Joseph is a member of the Board of Governors of the University and also of the Toronto General Hospital, and a man of very great prestige in the business world. He has given us valuable help in presenting our case.

Of course the Prime Minister made no commitment of any kind yesterday but he did give a very satisfactory\textsuperscript{xxii} hearing to the matter. I think he is sincerely and intelligently interested in nursing. There was less of nonsense in this interview with him than in most where nursing is under discussion. Russell’s steadfast pursuit of her goal in securing a meeting with the Prime Minister of Ontario is evident in the above, as is her astuteness in arranging to have at her side powerful community leaders who could assist in articulating the case for her position, namely that the Ontario government should agree to lease indefinitely a building to house the School of Nursing.
A change of government in Ontario occurred shortly after the above meeting and there was little action on the matter of the provincial government’s contribution to the establishment of a school of nursing. Adverse economic conditions following the 1929 stock market collapse undoubtedly contributed to the government’s inability to address the matter.

However slowly the wheels of government moved, Russell attempted to keep the request alive and to answer questions about the original plans for the school. An amended plan was submitted to the Prime Minister of Ontario to address concerns about preparing hospital nurses for fear of “arousing antagonism by starting anything of the nature of a new school for training or preparing nurses; i.e., recognition of the fear on the part of the public of adding more nurses to the present number of unemployed.” In her response to the concern, Russell replied that:

The original plans proposed to include a small experiment in the training of hospital nurses, (i.e., the basic training for undergraduates). This suggestion is now dropped from our plans. Thus no additional number of hospital nurses would be produced by this school . . . . The number of public health nurses to be produced by the proposed school would be not more than at present. Apparently there is still a shortage of trained public health nurses in the country.

Since experimentation with a course to prepare public health nurses was of primary importance to Russell, her willingness to eliminate the experiment to prepare hospital nurses showed flexibility in the face of criticism. However, since the course to prepare hospital nurses was not as critical as that to prepare public health nurses, it may not have been a difficult decision. Ultimately the Government’s dictum may have been a blessing in disguise as it would have been very difficult to carry on two separate diploma programs of considerable length. Not long thereafter, Russell was able to report to Beard that “This morning I have received a letter from the Prime Minister of Ontario approving our plans for the proposed School of Nursing and authorising us to communicate with you to this effect.” The Prime Minister affirmed in his letter that:

We are proposing to go ahead with the improvements to the building which you have asked for. They are making whatever alterations are necessary to make the building suitable for your purposes. The understanding is that you are to carry on the training in
Public Health Nursing and Hospital Management. The third thought, to experiment in various types of training, to be left in abeyance.\(^{xxvi}\)

A further hurdle to be overcome had been the need for approval by the Registration Council of Ontario in order that graduates of the proposed School could be duly registered as nurses. This required an amendment to the Registration Act of Ontario: “... so that a school such as this which we propose could be included among those defined by the Act. This amendment can be enacted March 1933.”\(^{xxxvii}\) Russell’s success in amending the legislation governing professional nursing practice to accommodate the graduates of her school was impressive, in that this is not normally an quick or easy process.

Russell informed and consulted Beard at every step in the process of implementing her plans, as she was undoubtedly highly cognizant of the need to keep the Foundation involved as plans took shape. She also addressed the issue of the balance between hospital and public health work in the new program and seemed anxious that Beard might be critical of the amount of time allocated to hospital work in the new 38 month diploma program: “... one matter that is, probably, of considerable importance. I refer to the question of how much emphasis is to be placed upon training for hospital staff nurses in our proposed school as compared with training for public health nursing.”, stating that she had understood that the Foundation would take a liberal interpretation of her plans.\(^{xxxviii}\)

With the establishment of the School of Nursing in 1933, Russell must have experienced a considerable measure of satisfaction in having her academic unit recognized as an independent administrative entity within the University of Toronto. Beard noted upon her first visit to the newly designated School that the building had been renovated satisfactorily and that a large sign out front announced The University of Toronto School of Nursing. As ever, her visit was planned carefully and full of meetings with the Rockefeller fellows, faculty members, nursing leaders and executives of hospitals and public health nursing organizations. She was met by Russell herself who arranged breakfasts and luncheons with nursing leaders and the two-day visit concluded with dinner at Russell’s home.\(^{xxix}\) It is evident through all of the records that guests
to the School were treated very well. Russell made time to discuss issues with them, ensure that they had all necessary amenities and were involved in social functions at which they could meet students, faculty and leaders in the nursing community. On her many trips to the offices of the Rockefeller Foundation, it is evident that she too was considered a special guest and entertained the their homes as well. Beard noted that: “You will be delighted to know that when we were having the old sofa in our Eaton living room re-upholstered recently, we came across a pair of your glasses in a case carefully autographed.”

Russell involved the officers of the Foundation in almost all of her plans and decisions. She sought advice frequently and encouraged site visits as often as possible. Typically she expressed delight at the prospect of a visit from the officers and began to make plans. On one occasion she wrote to Beard in a thoroughly charming and welcoming style: “I shall be delighted to have you come to Toronto at the time you suggest, that is the 14th of March. If by any chance you could arrange to stretch the time by one more day and thus have two nights here, I should be that much more pleased.” and also “I am not going to announce your coming - not to anybody, even fellowship visitors. There are enough people lying in wait to absorb your time completely, and the Toronto School wants and needs that time very much.”

In the annual report of the first year of the new program, Russell reported:

...satisfactory progress at the end of this first year. The new work has been done with greater ease than had been thought possible and, further, more has been accomplished in this first year of training than we had hoped for at the outset. These results are evidence of the fact that the principles underlying the experimental work are acceptable to the nursing, medical, and hospital authorities with whom we are working.

In the second issue of The Quarterly, a newsletter for members of the Toronto General Hospital Alumnae Association, Russell explained the new School and: “... the impasse at which we seem to have arrived, that is the conflict between hospital needs and school needs”. She underscores that” “There has been rather general agreement - at least among nurses - that these nursing schools will not have reasonable opportunity to do their work until such time as they are
placed in a financial position which leaves them independent of the hospital exchequer. She explains that under such an arrangement, “pupils are only pupils, the teachers are only teachers and the school carries no responsibility beyond its pupils and its curriculum;" Russell stresses the importance of the experiment for all nurses in Ontario since its purpose is to find improved ways of preparing nurses for practice.

At the midpoint of the annual grant of $17,500.00 for five years (1932 to 1937), President Cody wrote both to Dr. Max Mason, President of the Foundation and to Dr. F. F. Russell, Chairman of the International Health Board to enquire about extending the grant for an additional year. He explained that they were hesitant to enroll students in the Fall of 1935 in a course three years in length when the funding for the final year could be in jeopardy. A flurry of letters followed with Kathleen Russell apologizing to Beard for not having forewarned her that these letters would be forthcoming from the President of the University explaining that Cody had not been well when the letters had gone forth. In any case, F. F. Russell responded somewhat generally that “the Directors expressed interest and will . . . . take whatever action is necessary when the item is formally presented.” Since all institutions of higher education in Canada were suffering from increasing economic uncertainty as the Depression became deeper, finding extra financing in the amount of $17,500.00 in a public university such as the University of Toronto to maintain a program in the School of Nursing within the institutional budget would have presented a very difficult problem indeed, particularly as the funding had been furnished by the Foundation from 1932 - 1937.

This matter was apparently allowed to rest for a year, after which Cody sent a letter to Mason requesting a continuation of the Foundation grant for another five-year period from 1937 - 1942 at an increased rate of $20,000.00 per annum. Attached was an explanation of the need for a $2,500.00 increase in the annual rate. In a letter to Beard on the same day, Russell explains the request for another five year grant will be sent by Cody to Mason and that she shall send her a copy as soon as it reaches her. Almost all of Russell’s communications to Beard contain some discussion of the experimentation in curriculum going on in the School and in this letter she
We have gone just far enough with the undergraduate work to find out a few things: for example, the science work of the first year is not going to settle itself easily. There is real research to be done upon this matter: what to teach and how to teach it. It is fundamental to the whole question of the nurses’ training course and, as I have said, it should be attached more resolutely. . . . But it will need money and we are in difficulties already.\textsuperscript{li}

Russell’s remarks at the graduation of the first class from the three year combined program in hospital and public health nursing at which Beard gave the “Address to the Graduates”\textsuperscript{lii} provide detailed description of the importance of the university setting for the development of the work of the School: “We are not asking for more education for nurses: that is too vague a generalization to have meaning. It is not more education that we seek, but more appropriate education, with better use of the time and effort and money that are being expended, . . .”\textsuperscript{lii} Russell goes on to explain that her plea for a higher standard of nursing education: “. . . is not a pretentious claim for university frills, to dress up the art of nursing and thus to give satisfying service. The University can, and does . . . reserve its diplomas for those who reach certain fine standards.”\textsuperscript{liii} On this occasion, Russell was speaking on a public occasion to graduates, their families and the general public. She attempted to dispel what was undoubtedly a criticism she heard frequently, namely that her goals centred on status rather than academic quality and she refers to the quality, standards and opportunities to seek knowledge offered within the university. At this point she went further and made a statement that was much misunderstood, namely that: “We want no degrees. We are more than content to let the other professions worry and argue about these.”\textsuperscript{liv} Her argument that she was more interested in working on the content and substance of her program than in spending a great deal of time carrying forward a request, perhaps prematurely, to confer a degree in nursing was clear. Since the experiment was in its infancy with many more details to be worked out before the program would be at the stage where a degree could be contemplated.

A site visit brought Beard and Dr. Wilbur A. Sawyer, Director of the International Health
Division to Toronto in October, 1936 for the purpose of determining whether or not the
Foundation should continue its program funding for the School of Nursing in response to
Cody’s request. The discussions were difficult and Beard noted in her diary that Sawyer “felt
that the University should state its position and make an effort to appropriate all or part of the
current costs of the School not already provided for and thus put new money into the School.” lvii
He further suggested that he would be glad to provide further support if: “if the University would
put into its budget which goes to the Legislature for approval of an amount of say $10,000.00
toward the support of the School in addition to the $5,000.00 which has been appropriated from
year to year . . . lvii Beard also stated that Sawyer “advised Miss Russell to make no effort
toward securing a new building until current expenses had been provided for.” lviii A follow-up
letter asked Russell to advise the Foundation whether: the committee to consider the future of the
School had been appointed, and suggested: “. . . asking Dr. Fitzgerald, Director of the School of
Hygiene and you to take an active part in the work of such a committee.”lix Russell’s reply came
ten days later announcing the formation of the Committee and its membership. Sawyer’s
subsequent message to Cody reminds him that the University must take its share of the
obligation to provide financing for the School: “I am glad to learn from your letter of October 19
that the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto has expressed a favorable attitude
toward the carrying on of the School of Nursing and will probably place an additional amount in
the budget for the School.” lx
A report from the above Committee documented two meetings concluding that because of the progress of the School, the university grant could be increased from $5,000.00 to $7,500.00 for the Sessions 1937 - 1938, 1938 - 1939 and 1939 - 1940. A review at the end of two years, rather than three was recommended and rather ominously added: “... with the proviso that all incoming students after this current year 1936-37 be admitted only on the understanding that the course may be terminated at the end of any year; the Director of the School to give written notice to the students to this effect.” Russell asterisked this statement and penned a note at the bottom of the copy of the Report she sent to the Foundation, “I have told the President that it is quite impossible for me to do this. I would ask no student to enter on such conditions.” It seemed suddenly as though the rug could be pulled from under the School at short notice. The reason for the Committee’s having put this matter forward is explained rather graphically in Beard’s diary for March 12, 1937: “All day with Miss Kathleen Russell. Because our designation of the $20,000.00 appropriation for the School of Nursing at Toronto University has been delayed so long, she has had a difficult situation to deal with in connection with the Committee . . .” The Committee apparently had assumed that the Foundation was withdrawing from funding the School. However, Beard noted that both she and Fitzgerald had given Russell informal briefings on the action of the Foundation and that if Russell had communicated to her the thinking of the Committee at the time, it might have been possible to allay their fears. She stated further:

However, the Committee is composed of men who are rather old and most of them deaf, who have many responsibilities connected with the whole university, and who seem to have little understanding of the actual relation between the IHD and the School of Nursing. In any case, the “Report” of the Special Committee on the School of Nursing” sent 11/4/36 to the Board of Governors was quite disturbing to Miss Russell.

Beard went on to say that Russell indicated that President Cody agreed with her stand that students could not be admitted under the condition proposed. Also, she noted: “it brings up the question of whether our designations ought to be made a good deal earlier than they are.” Beard and Russell had spent the day in question meeting with Dr. A. J. Warren who was acting
in the absence of Sawyer. A letter was drawn up to be sent to the University during the day and shared with Russell who stated that “if the letter were mailed she felt confident it would mean that the Nursing School would be closed, as it will be impossible for the University to assume all of a major part of the support of the School after the proposed donation of $20,000 had been exhausted.” \(^{lxvii}\)

At the urging of Beard and Russell, Warren decided not to mail the letter. Since the Scientific Directors of the Foundation would not meet until April to make its financial commitments for the coming year, the $20,000.00 grant could not be confirmed. Several days later, Beard and Warren agreed on a slightly “softer” version of the letter and decided to send it to President Cody through Russell, giving her the opportunity not to send it if she felt it would harm the interests of the School further. Russell confirmed that she sent the letter on to the President and that it would be helpful, but that the estimates for the year: “are based on a reduced income, and I think you ought to be informed about this as you may question our action in allowing this to happen.” \(^{lxviii}\)

Russell’s prediction was correct in that the President was not willing to count on the funds from the Foundation in putting estimates before the Board and was proceeding on the basis that Rockefeller Funds would not be forthcoming. She referred again to the impediment to continued enrollment and the dire consequences that could be expected if this was allowed to stand:

If our Board of Governors will remove the veto against unconditional enrolment of students for the coming year, we can proceed satisfactorily for another year and this would give us eight or nine months more to see what can be done locally. If our Board will not remove this condition, we may just have to wind up the three-year course, finishing off the classes now enrolled: this could be done by two years from next November. \(^{lix}\)

Despite her dire description of the future of the basic program if the Board of Governors failed to allow unconditional enrollment of students in the 1937-38 term, Russell stated somewhat more optimistically: “But I shall not feel hopeless if we can get just this short reprieve of one more year. It is only during the present year that the School is in entire running order . . .
She also pledged to keep the officers of the Foundation more informed of developments in Toronto, and indicated that “The President has given me the formidable task of seeing some members of the Board and carrying on their education: side by side with that I am pursuing possible benefactors. So the days are full.”

Beard’s diary recorded her thoughts on a visit to Toronto a week later, indicating that The President had discussed with the Chairman of the Board, Dr. Macdonald who was quite sympathetic to potentially removing the condition, and that “Both Dr. Cody and Miss Russell feel sure that this action will not hold.”

Finally the long-awaited confirmation came from the International Health Division that “the sum of Canadian $20,000 was designated to the University of Toronto for the School of Nursing for use during the two-year period beginning July 1, 1937 and ending June 30, 1939.”

Russell was not one to sit on a problem, in this case a psychological one, that might continue to damage the reputation of the School. Following receipt of the positive news of the grant from the Foundation, Russell wrote to Beard of both the “service” and the “injury” effect on the School of the Rockefeller Foundation’s actions. She stated that the service was that the University was forced to raise its subsidy for the school and that the injury was “Opinion that has gone broadcast to the effect that ‘the Rockefeller Foundation has dropped the School.’ Nothing I can say will stop the opinion. Nothing here can stop the ill effect of this.”

She explained further that there was general misunderstanding of the need for a school for public health nursing and that “no Rockefeller foundation project has been cut off sharply in Toronto (I know you have not cut us off, but the president - and everyone else - thinks that you have and Dr. Warren’s letter confirmed that opinion).”

In Russell’s view, the situation led some to believe that “. . . you have judged the School and found it wanting. Any argument or explanation on my part appears as a natural, but pathetic, effort to explain away a failure.”

She expressed a need to be able to demonstrate that the Foundation believed in the School in order to dispel the misgivings because as she noted: “Now I am in the ridiculous situation of presenting an apparent failure while you are sending people from the ends of the earth to see this failure.”

It is evident from the foregoing problems that Russell’s time throughout the previous year had been largely devoted
to trying to maintain the promised financing of the school. Thus, she pleads for time and the opportunity to develop the School: “Because the growth has been so rapid, leadership is needed desperately to keep the whole thing from chaos, . . . . I am begging for freedom that my time and thought may go into the work of the School and to give the School a chance to live.”

The plea evidently struck a chord as a week later Russell was in New York meeting with Beard and Sawyer. Beard’s diary described a session used to plan a strategy that would include a letter from Cody to Sawyer following the annual University Board of Governors meeting where budgets and commitments for the coming year were decided. The President would ask the Foundation “what they intend to do in regard to the School of Nursing and asking us to help with the deficit.” In this way, Sawyer and Beard strategized that the Foundation could “consider setting aside over a period of possibly four years a sum of money to supplement Toronto funds so that Miss Russell would have assurance of a permanent organization during a stated time.”

As the crisis of the moment temporarily moved backstage, Russell began to work vigorously to ensure the survival of her School. Early in September, 1937 she acted on the suggestion of Sawyer and Beard as outlined previously in their May meeting in order to ensure that the School could move to a firmer financial footing. Accordingly she reported to Sawyer that she had proposed to the President that during the annual Board review of estimates of the School in early 1938, that the Board “be asked to review then the matter of the future support of this School, instead of waiting to do this in January, 1939 as had been planned.” She also requested that the Board be asked to “agree to a scheme of financing for the ensuring 4 years, namely for the years 1938-1939; 1939-1940; 1940-1941; 1941-1942” and “That for that 4 year period (i.e., 1938-1942) the University shall commit itself to definite support of this School, in increasing amount.” Following the agreement of the University to this, it could approach the Rockefeller Foundation for additional assistance for the four years in question.

Subsequent to a meeting in New York with officers of the Foundation, continuing support of Russell’s work to develop the School is evident in Beard’s diary note: “In every way the School seems to have come into its own; it is more stable, is looked to by the nurses of the
Province, by the university faculty, and by the doctors in Toronto, for leadership in nursing matters. . . . The faculty is . . . quite superior.\textsuperscript{lxiii} Unquestionably Beard’s advocacy for the School was important as she advised the other officers of the International Health Division.

Further to the request that the Board of Governors review matters relative to the ongoing support of the School in early 1938, Sawyer’s diary of May 17, 1938 indicates knowledge of a forthcoming deputation from the University to ask for an endowment to assist in the ongoing financing of the School.\textsuperscript{lxiv} Accordingly, he met with Raymond B. Fosdick, President of the Rockefeller Foundation to determine the potential for an endowment explaining that it would probably take an endowment of about $300,000.00 to ensure an amount equal to that now being contributed to the School by the International Health Division. Sawyer explained that the School was his first priority for the year’s allocation since it was “playing an important part in public health nursing education and the training of I.H.D. fellows,” to which Fosdick replied: “t . . . that he thought if the request was received from Toronto and seemed reasonable and if the S.D. [scientific directors] made a request to the Foundation, that he would approve presentation of the request at the December meeting of the Trustees.”\textsuperscript{lxv}

Sawyer met with Cody in New York on June 13 and a formal request followed from the President of the University requesting an endowment to provide ongoing supplementary funding for the needs of the School in the amount of $250,000.00, since “The University’s resources are not sufficient to carry the full burden of the costs of the School”\textsuperscript{lxvi} since its revenues had decreased by half over the course of the Depression. Beard wrote warmly to Russell two weeks later to say that “[ . . . on Monday our Board voted to recommend to the Foundation Board that the endowment fund which Dr. Cody and Dr. Sawyer discussed be given to Toronto University for the School of Nursing.”\textsuperscript{lxvii} Sawyer confirmed in a letter to Cody that the request for the endowment to be made as of July 1, 1939 had been approved by the International Health Division and would go forward to the Trustees of the Foundation in December.\textsuperscript{lxviii} The endowment was duly approved by the Trustees and also additional funds to supplement the interest on the endowment for the years 1939-40 and 1940-41 so that the School could be assured
Russell expressed heartfelt thanks in a handwritten letter to Sawyer: “I think you will understand how much this means to us and our gratitude is correspondingly great. The gift puts the School on a firm foundation and we can go on now with assurance of growth and development. . . . We thank you for your faith in the future of the School.”

Following the retirement of Mary Beard in October of 1938, M. Elizabeth Tennant was appointed to succeed her on the staff of the International Health Board. Since the grant to the School had been described as terminal, one might expect that the relationship with the Foundation would not be as close as in the past. Undoubtedly Russell had no intention that this would be the final grant from the Foundation to the School, and she continued to keep the Foundation through Tennant informed of School activities, the progress of the Foundation fellows in their studies and most significantly, operational difficulties: “The registration is large in all classes: indeed I think we have reached, and gone beyond, our limit for our present facilities.” For her part, Tennant’s diary note confirms the problem: “The School now has its heaviest enrollment of full-time students - 135 - and every nook and cranny of the School building is now in use for classrooms, laboratories, office space and residence quarters.” With the Second World War underway, more difficulties for the School loomed in the form of potentially reduced enrollment and fewer Rockefeller fellows in the next year, meaning substantially lower tuition revenue. Tennant wrote: “. . . Miss Russell is discouraged. She feels that it will be practically impossible to get additional financial assistance from the Province. She has been too conservative in making her estimates and now the School is handicapped because of inadequate funds.”

Like Beard who had been a tenacious advocate for Russell and the Toronto School, Tennant took up the cause with equal vigor: “Every nook and cranny in the School building are used for classrooms, laboratories, offices and nurses’ residence . . .” Referring to a student for whom Russell had to provide housing rather unexpectedly because of a delay in funds for an internship from the School of Hygiene, Tennant’s diary note states rather dramatically: “this
meant carrying out rigid economies such as doing without janitor service for a week, cutting
down on much needed maid service and reducing the amount of food served to students and
staff." xcvi, making the point that there were no surplus funds in the bare bones budget of the
School.

Tenant was effusive in her praise of Russell’s ability as a leader and administrator, and as
an individual who understood what was needed in organizing and implementing an
undergraduate nursing curriculum:

Miss Russell is an unusually able administrator, a very scholarly person. Her ability as a
leader in nursing education is outstanding . . . . Miss Russell is the greatest thinker in
nursing education that MET knows and her untiring efforts to analyze and improve the
content of the curricula in nursing at the University School makes this an invaluable place
for the Rockefeller Foundation to send nursing fellows. xcvi

The care that was taken to develop substantive educational experiences for the Rockefeller
fellows remained an important thread cementing the relationship between the officers of the
Foundation and the School. Details of the plans for each of the students are discussed in the
correspondence and unqualified approval of these is apparent throughout: “EKR discussed
program she has in mind for Miss Janet Corwin, special fellow. She will have JC assist her and
carry on some of the teaching. This should be invaluable preparation for JC, to be tutored by
such a master craftsman.” xcvii

Although Russell’s earlier plan to lengthen the undergraduate program had come to
naught, she proposed the introduction of a new four-year undergraduate program in nursing
leading to a Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree, reporting to Tennant: “I want to let you
know that the proposals for a new degree course in this school have gone through all the
necessary committees and councils until finally it was passed, very willingly, by the Senate last
Friday evening.” xcviii The Board of Governors approval followed and the program commenced
alongside the diploma program which was now described as being 39 months in length in the fall
of 1942. Although as noted above, some have interpreted Russell’s earlier reluctance to seek a
degree for the basic nursing program that emerged in 1933 was somewhat out of step with the normal procedure in universities in offering credentials for undergraduate work. The answer likely lies not so much that Russell was firmly opposed to the degree designation, but rather that she was opposed to universities granting degrees when their programs in nursing amounted to vocational preparation in hospitals where educational principles were not a primary consideration and a process over which they had no control. Indeed she decried this practice that was followed in all universities granting degrees in nursing in Canada and the U.S. at the time. Her idea that the school must be administratively free to guide and direct the education of nursing students in their both their academic and clinical work was quite revolutionary.

Russell no doubt also wanted to dispel the common criticism she faced, namely that her aim in developing a basic program of nursing education in a university rather than a hospital was directed mainly at raising the status of the nurse. Since she wanted to ensure that the program she developed was worthy of degree status, she was in no rush to attach a degree to her early experiments in undergraduate nursing education. Russell never wavered from her stance that her quest was first and foremost educational in the interest of meeting the needs of society for more appropriately educated nurses. In her Annual Report of 1941-42, she observed with evident delight that: “The outstanding event of the past year . . . . has been the establishment, by the Senate, of the degree of Bachelor of Science in Nursing, and the approval of certain courses of study leading thereto.” She also addressed the pressure to award a degree that she had faced up to this point:

There have been various reasons for refraining from degree work up to the present. In the first place we have shared in the more conservative attitude toward the rapid development of new degree courses in the American and Canadian universities and thus have held back deliberately. Furthermore, and quite apart from educational philosophy, it was obvious from the standpoint of practical working conditions that at the time the school was started there was no possibility of organising sound degree studies.”

Operating funds were a continuing problem in the face of the increased expectations associated with the war effort, and it was noted in the docket put before the directors of the
International Health Division that “The pressure on the staff has become so great that the School cannot take on further responsibilities unless additional assistance is received.” The Foundation thus approved “the sum of C$2,500 a year for two and one-half years to cover the salary of an additional faculty member and clerical assistance.” Thus, the Foundation continued to provide support to the School it had nurtured so carefully over the previous decade.

Although more than a decade earlier, the Foundation had offered to make a large capital grant to assist with a building, that offer had been withdrawn because of the fact that the University did not provide matching assistance and operating funds were granted to establish the School. Therefore, after considerable operating grants including an endowment to the School, somewhat surprisingly the Foundation made another offer of assistance to construct a permanent building to house the School of Nursing. Thus, in May, 1946, the Foundation approved capital assistance for building a School of Nursing with the proviso that “this sum will become available when the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto shall have secured pledges from other sources for the same purpose in the amount of Canadian $350,000 . . . “ Again the onus was upon the University to come forward with its matching share of funds for the proposed building. However, other problems began to emerge in the University’s management of the process of the building for the School of Nursing. President Sidney Smith who had succeeded Dr. Cody in 1945, operated in a very different manner from his predecessor. A diary note by Dr. George Strode, Director of the International Health Division, highlighted a serious problem within the University:

MET reported that Miss Russell’s trouble centered about an action by President Smith of Toronto University, who, apparently without prior consultation, took the matter of construction of the nursing school building out of her hands and put it into those of the University Building Committee. A strained tone is detected in the letter from Russell to Strode copied to Sidney Smith referring to the above information: “The President wishes now to discuss the matter with you directly, and would like to see you in New York. . . I wonder if you would be kind enough to let us know
whether you expect to be home at this time." A handwritten note from Tennant to Hugh Smith indicates that President Sidney Smith will be coming to New York and asks if he and Strode would see him together, noting:

There are three points I’d like to have him hear (1) We made the capital grant (the last one by the R.F.) because of EKR’s leadership and scholarly ability (2) We use the School of Nursing for fellows primarily because of EKR (3) We made it clear to the Board of Scientific Directors that a suitable site would be chosen. I don’t know what has happened. EKR’s letter is for our information.

The formal request from Sidney Smith to extend the termination date of the capital grant came two months later, stating: “In view of the decision to postpone the erection of the building, no steps have been taken to procure a suitable site for the new School of Nursing.” He added that “I can assure you that we do intend to erect a new building for the School of Nursing, and that we will secure in addition a suitable site for it.” The period of appropriation of the capital grant was duly extended by the officers of the Foundation to December 31, 1949.

However disturbed the Foundation was with the way the situation had developed, the direction from Strode to Wilson was that: “None of us have been too pleased with the course of events at Toronto but we have definitely taken the position that it was not for us to intervene in their internal affairs.” A request for an extension of two years to December 31, 1953 followed with a report that the University had been given approval to “. . . proceed forthwith to call for tenders, the acceptance of any tender being conditional on a maximum figure of $826,700.” The extension of the Rockefeller capital grant was duly granted by the Foundation.

The end of the struggle over the building was not to come until the winter of 1953 when the building was completed and Foundation made arrangements to pay out its capital grant to the University of Toronto. Russell had retired the previous year, exhausted over the long struggle to gain a suitable facility to carry forward nursing education at the University of Toronto. Carpenter noted that Russell demonstrated the qualities at the outset that made her so successful, namely that she thought that “. . . one should never be content with things as they are,” and further that her “. . . discontent with the traditional approach to nursing education became
apparent in an uncompromising struggle for a progressive experimental approach which would establish and maintain high academic and professional standards . . .

Differences of opinion over the building were irreconcilable and compounded by the impasse between Sidney Smith and Russell, the failure of the Government of Ontario to make good on its promise to donate the land at 7 Queen’s Park to the School of Nursing and the reluctance of the University of Toronto to give priority to construction of the School of Nursing. Although these differences seemed to be devastating at the time, in the long term they were less significant. The building was erected and has successfully served the academic unit that is now the Faculty of Nursing at the University of Toronto for half a century. As views changed on the value of residence accommodation for nursing students as a means of socialization and shaping values, this became less important in the total scheme of things. Above all the difficulties described do not overshadow the impressive accomplishments in nursing education that occurred at the University of Toronto from the establishment of the Department of Public Health Nursing in 1920 until Russell’s retirement in 1952. Kathleen Russell was a leading figure in the emerging role of women in society and was accorded many honors for her personal contributions. These included the degree of Doctor of Civil Law, *honoris causa*, from King’s College, Nova Scotia in 1939, the first woman to be so honored from that institution; the Mary Agnes Snively Medal of the Canadian Nurses Association for distinguished service to nursing in 1940; the Florence Nightingale Medal by the International Red Cross in 1949, the Red Cross Society’s highest award; and Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, from the University of Toronto in 1956.

Indeed, the grants provided to the University of Toronto School of Nursing under Russell’s direction at a critical time in the development of its undergraduate degree program were pivotal in allowing for the implementation of a radical departure from the early nursing programs, namely the integrated degree program. Experimentation with various models for a such a program over a period of three decades laid the foundation for a new approach to university nursing education in Canada in the future. The program developed by Russell and her
colleagues was to become the dominant model for university nursing programs in Canada as the quality of the educational experience and the subsequent superiority of the program model became widely recognized. Ultimately the Royal Commission on Health Services recommended in 1964 that all 5 year non-integrated degree programs in nursing be phased out and integrated programs developed in their stead. Unlike reports and recommendations of most Royal Commissions established by the federal government, this recommendation was acted upon immediately and changes implemented across the country within two short years of the publication of the Report.

Kathleen Russell had an inordinate degree of success in securing grants from the Rockefeller Foundation. From the moment she was appointed Director of the Department of Public Health Nursing in 1920, she began to lay the groundwork for establishing her academic unit on a firm foundation. Carpenter reported that: “One of her first acts following her appointment as Director of the Department of Public Health Nursing was to visit New York to observe developments there and to meet leaders in the nursing profession. At the outset she was given space and facilities in two different locations through the generosity of the Faculty of Medicine and the Department of Social Services. The difficulty of having the students and staff in different locations led her to search for a more permanent location where the entire unit could be together, but space was at a premium in the expansionist days of the 1920s. In 1924, Dr. Fitzgerald, Director of the School of Hygiene, offered to house Russell’s unit in the new building being constructed for the School of Hygiene. According to Carpenter: “When the Department moved into the School of Hygiene in 1927, it became a unit ‘under the guidance’ of the School but with administrative independence. The influence of Dr. Fitzgerald was extremely helpful as he had strong connections with the Rockefeller Foundation, serving as a scientific director of the International Health Division from 1931-34 and 1936-38. He continued his strong support of nursing education when he became Dean of Medicine in 1932. Through these connections, the International Health Division became interested in Toronto as a site for the education of its fellows in public health nursing, fellows who came from all over the
world, enriched the School and its programs and enhanced Toronto’s reputation as an outstanding place to study public health nursing.

The International Health Division supported two other North American schools of nursing as they implemented their public health nursing program, namely Yale and Vanderbilt universities. Although they gave each of these schools significant sums of money, it was clearly the University of Toronto that was considered to have the most innovative programs in keeping with Division objectives. Vanderbilt was not considered a success: “When in 1933 the International Health Division took over the nursing education program, the situation at Vanderbilt was reported as unsatisfactory, the school accomplishing little more than the care of patients in the hospital . . .” There were other problems and the Foundation eventually terminated its grants to the school. Although Yale also received substantial grants, its program did not really meet the objectives of the Foundation since it required a degree for entrance and then offered a master’s degree for a nursing course of 30 months in length. The voluminous correspondence between Russell and Foundation officers, the numerous site visits to Toronto by the officers and the overriding praise that they accorded the work of the School attest to the level of interest of the Foundation in this School. Toronto was definitely favored as far as placing Foundation fellows was concerned. Farley pointed out, “. . . an extraordinary 39% (176:476) of all nursing fellowships were given to foreign (mainly Black) American students to study there, whereas Yale received only 20!”

There is also the question of why Toronto was selected over other Canadian centres as the recipient of significant levels of Foundation grants. Since the Foundation was very interested in support for medicine, it assessed Canadian medical schools, concluding that the University of Toronto’s school was the most outstanding, followed closely by that of McGill. The Foundation aimed in medicine as in nursing to give selected support to high quality institutions in order that they could become outstanding models and, as a result, provide leadership in the field. Nursing in Toronto had the advantage of strong support from medicine and the School of Hygiene, both of which were being well-supported by the Foundation. Although the Foundation gave a grant
upon request to the University of British Columbia Department of Health between 1936 and 1939, it was a limited request for a field work supervisor to supervise the work of public health nursing students in the field. However, the fact that a professor of preventive medicine was listed as the Acting Head of the Department of Nursing and Health was clearly not in keeping with the Foundation expectation that a nurse would be in charge of a Department where public health nursing was the focus of study.

The Division had been interested from the outset in schools that integrated hospital and public health nursing education and Russell initiated the first of the experiments in basic nursing education incorporating public health nursing as it prepared to move into its new quarters in the School of Hygiene: “In 1926 the first experiment in basic nursing education to be offered in the Department was introduced, a co-operative arrangement between the University and the Toronto General Hospital School of Nursing.” However, Russell reasoned that there were better ways of integrating the two forms of nursing education and for this she sought the resources available from the Rockefeller Foundation. The extra financing she received allowed her to experiment with improved ways of preparing nurses for public health nursing using small and select classes of students. The high regard in which she was held by the officers of the Foundation at all levels is reflected throughout the correspondence concerning the work of the School in relation to the grants awarded to the School by the Foundation.

Russell’s intellectual acumen, her ability to express her innovative ideas about the mission of the School combined with her personal charm and sensitivity and her passion for her work undoubtedly contributed to her excellent relationships with officers of the Rockefeller Foundation. Despite the fact that the University of Toronto met its financial obligations to the School slowly and very reluctantly, it is nothing short of amazing that amidst such recalcitrance, Russell managed to secure the promised funds. The Government of Ontario for its part, also moved incredibly slowly and time and time again reneged on its promises for building space. It took a monumental effort for the University to secure the $250,000 matching grant from the Government, and then when it came it was offered in a piecemeal way over a period of 15 years.
Nevertheless, Russell was steadfast and never lost sight of her objectives. The degree of intensity with which she approached these, the clarity of her vision, her capacity for long and sustained hours of work and her superior intellect were critical factors in her success. In addition to this, Russell appears to have been a highly charismatic individual. She had excellent interpersonal skills and an extraordinary capacity to explain her points of view to others in such a way as to persuade them of the merit of her ideas.

The story of the development of university nursing education at the University of Toronto is an amazing success story. It occurred through the efforts of key players in the School of Nursing, the Rockefeller Foundation and the University of Toronto. It had a tremendous influence upon the longterm development of university-level nursing education in Canada and elsewhere through the basic nursing students and Foundation fellows who were the graduates of its programs. The program developed by 1952 provided a demonstration of what could be achieved through applying sound educational principles in the development of university programs in nursing and achieved an impressive profile in Canada and elsewhere. The model developed at the University of Toronto was one that all other university schools in Canada would emulate by the late 1960s. The influence of this work made possible through generous grants from the Rockefeller Foundation continues in Canada today where all university nursing programs offer an undergraduate degree program based on the University of Toronto model.
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