

the same old way, in the direction of least resistance or rather in the direction of least endeavor, and we let "George do it." And George does it and he don't do it right. We *know* he don't. His work is all full of flaws. We see a dozen different places where we could have done it—oh! so much better and more effectively. But we didn't and we don't. We fear to plunge into the seething maelstrom of work and self-sacrifice. We are afraid that we may be criticized. We are afraid that we may not be appreciated. *We are afraid to do a man's work for the sake of men and not for the sake of self!* And so we drift, and drift, and drift, just like Charles Lamb did in his dreams, until we awaken from our dreams to find that the shadows of life are deepening and the evening of eternity is drawing near, and then we realize how little we have done despite the insistent calls of our dream-children, during the years that have passed and gone; how little we are doing for ourselves and our fellowmen!

Just a word more and my preachment will be done. Be strong and loyal members of the grand old American Pharmaceutical Association. Do all in your power to advance the objects it stands for. Develop yourself and your latent possibilities. There is more in you than you give yourselves credit for. Don't be afraid of work for the benefit of the other fellow. It will benefit you in the end, as much so or more, than it will him. Dream, dream, dream all you can of what you can do to help yourself and your fellow pharmacists, but be sure—very sure—that your dreams are not idle figments of the imagination, but real pictures, beautiful pictures, *and* that they are backed by action! action! action!

Paraphrasing Froude, it can be said that "the dreams that men use are the only real dreams, the only ones that have life and growth and convert themselves in practical power. All the rest hang like dust about the brain or dry like rain-drops off the stones."

COLLEGE EXAMINATIONS—A DEFENSE.

PROF. ZADA M. COOPER.

Examinations have been called a "useless antiquity" but, however antiquated they may be, there seems to be no modern substitute that at all accomplishes the desired result. However, among the arguments presented are some that are not without merit and deserve some consideration in any discussion of the question.

It is said that, if they are given to compel review, they are quite unnecessary, that it is possible to review without the test at the end. In theory, that may be true but it has little basis in fact. Experience has shown that such review will be half-hearted with some students. Other individuals will not even do their regular work consistently, to say nothing of review work, unless the fear or dread of an examination hangs over them. Nothing less will induce them to work. There is a possibility here, which has probably been tried more or less successfully by every teacher. It is to set a certain standard, the attainment of which, will excuse from the examination; requiring students to do the review work, not knowing that they shall not be obliged to take the examination, until

the hour for the examination arrives. The method offers considerable inducement, putting a premium on effort and, though it cannot be applied in all cases, for some courses, it brings excellent results.

We are told that examinations do not, as is claimed for them, teach self-control, and we must admit the truth of that statement in some isolated cases. The unreasoning dread of the test, may cause nervous excitable individuals to lose the little hold that they have upon themselves, and consequently come far short of doing their best. It is impossible to get any statistics bearing upon this point, but observation of many classes, leads to the conclusion that it more often cultivates self-control than lack of it. Though not an unmixed good, the good outweighs the bad.

We shall have to grant that drill in expressing themselves well in a limited time, could be better accomplished in some other way, that is, we must grant it, as an abstract fact, but, is it true in a College of Pharmacy? But for written examinations, would they have any such practice at all? English composition can find no place in the *curriculum* of a College of Pharmacy. However much we may theorize about the advantage to be derived from instruction of that sort, and the necessity for every pharmacist to know how to express himself well, we know no such work can have a place on the schedule. Nor is it the duty of any instructor in a College of Pharmacy to teach the use of the English language, but if examinations were to be eliminated entirely, actual practice would be reduced to a minimum. They give exercise to faculties otherwise somewhat dormant during college years. "Theoretically, when the undergraduate has assembled his thoughts, he is ready and competent to write them, but, practically, he is neither entirely ready nor usually entirely competent." It is not enough to think well, we all need practice in expressing our thoughts. Good authorities believe that an individual "must be able to say what he knows and *write* what he knows or he does not know it." Consider again written examinations. A man will learn, to some extent at least, to say what he knows, in clean clear-cut sentences, without superfluous language. This will be true especially, if the instructor urges the necessity of writing briefly but to the point, leaving nothing to be taken for granted and if he gives little credit for rambling, meaningless generalizations, in lieu of real knowledge of the subject. "The student must express his intellectual gains even as he absorbs them, or the crystallization of knowledge into personal thought will be checked in the beginning."

Probably the objection to examinations which is really of greatest force, is, that it is a poor way to determine what a student knows; that his actual standing is better determined in some other way. It is quite probable that if this were the only reason for giving examinations, there would be almost none. Few teachers make an examination, the only test of a man's knowledge of the subject; there are so many factors to be considered. If there were no other way to decide that question than an instructor's personal estimate, decided from daily work, the judgment of any conscientious teacher would come nearer the truth, but estimating a student's knowledge is a minor point, when considering the advisability of giving examinations.

Another objection that cannot be ignored, is that examinations give rise to a wrong spirit. We find in every class a small number who work for marks alone,

forgetting that mastery of the subject should be their aim. Not only is the real purpose forgotten, but all pleasure in the actual work is destroyed. Examinations are responsible for "cramming" in its worst form, a practice which may give some temporary knowledge but no power. Then, too, they give opportunity for cheating, a despicable habit which demoralizes the individual who resorts to it and the sight of which dishonesty, breeds disgust and contempt and discouragement in the hearts of honest individuals. An instructor may overcome, to some extent these bad effects, by emphasizing the fact that marks do not depend alone upon examinations and by bringing swift punishment upon the offender, when detected.

In this twentieth century, more and more emphasis is laid upon deeds. Men and women are judged by deeds; their efficiency by what they can do in their own particular line. Nowhere, perhaps, is this more true than in Pharmacy. A druggist judges his clerk by his ability to fill prescriptions, to sell goods, to get on with people. Are we not all saying, "What can he do? Can he deliver the goods?" Even in college, we put much stress on laboratory work and upon actual dispensing ability; we give courses in salesmanship; we are constantly teaching students to *do*; emphasizing the ability to *do* and telling them that their success, their very bread and butter depends on what they can *do*. This is all quite proper. Not for a moment, should we belittle this side of the question. On the other hand, are we not getting a one-sided estimate, when we judge men and women *only* by what they can do? Judging only by deeds, is not enough, because there are instances in life where that sort of test cannot be made or where it is inadequate. Take, for instance, the student fresh from college. He may not be able to do everything required of him and yet be potentially powerful. It may be in him to do the very best things, but some other test is needed. Among other elements of judgment what he says verbally, or in writing, must be considered. During his college career, recitations help to train him to speak, as does work in a literary society; examinations play their part in the training to write.

It is only too true that the tongue is used to deceive, and that language is perverted to create all sorts of false impressions, but, still, language is an important medium of expression and an "index of character and ideals." To a certain extent, the use of good language is a matter of gift, but it is also a talent that admits of cultivation. Every man whether gifted or not, ought to be able to talk and write intelligently about his own work. The idea is not that men are expected to produce literature, but that they should be able to tell what they know, to put in concrete form their own ideas, so that others can understand them. Some one has said that "speech and writing, if you get them in fair samples, indicate the extent and the value of a college education better than a degree." The way an individual talks and writes, is, in some measure, an indication of his learning and general fitness, as well as his native capacity.

Graduates, probably, often leave college with a sense of relief in the thought that examinations are over, but they are mistaken. They are only leaving behind one sort, to encounter another sort. In school, examination-questions have asked what they know. Life asks, not only what we know but what we can do

and what we are. "Life accepts no excuses," and this examination never ends but is renewed each day. The student does not always realize that scholarship is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, and that end, is life in its broadest sense, ability for service in his chosen calling and ability to enjoy every minute of that service. If our lives measure up to such standards we are passing life's examinations, perhaps, not as well as we wish we might, for our ideals are always above and beyond our realization, but creditably, nevertheless.

REVIEW OF CURRENT PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE.

FRANKLIN M. APPLE, PHAR. D.

PHARMACEUTICAL ERA.

An explanation of the Narcotic Law of New York City is made by Commissioner Goldwater, on pp. 459 and 460.

"*A Colorless Ointment of Iodid of Potassium*" (p. 463) is an interesting and valuable article.

"*The origin and practices of old-time Pharmacy*" are the subject of an interesting paper by Mrs. H. Ray Kenaston, on pp. 614 *et seq.*

"*The Manufacture of Biological Products*," on pp. 453 and 454 is the title of an article, to be continued, by Dr. F. E. Stewart.

"*A Corrosive Subhmate Antidote*," on pp. 455 and 456, demonstrates the workings of a close-reasoning, ingenious mind and should lead to practical results.

"*Colloidal Sulphur*" is described on p. 463.

"*Glycerine, as a Sterilizing Bath*," is on p. 464.

"*Proprietaries in Great Britain*," (p. 457) is an interesting and timely article and contains the conclusions and recommendations of a Committee which considered the subject of these preparations.

DRUGGISTS CIRCULAR.

"*The Validity of Druggists Trade-Marks*," (pp. 605 *et seq.*) discusses a "live topic."

"*Making Finger Prints Visible*," (p. 619) is an interesting article on the subject of identifying criminals.

"*Camphor and its Preparations*," are entertainingly treated by Prof. Leon Lascoff, (pp. 613-614.)

A formula for a Liquid Disinfectant for the disinfection of rooms, is given on p. 622, and the use of Coumarin and Balsam Peru is suggested on p. 623, to cover the odor of tar.

"*Petroleum Confections*," are the subject of a paper on p. 629.

"*Digitalis and its Pharmacology*," a paper by Dr. R. A. Hatcher, concludes in this issue, (pp. 607-610.)

Salicyl-Chlorid is suggested as a possible substitute for Aspirin. (p. 618.)

The use of *Lactic Acid Ferments* as remedial agents, is discussed on p. 620.

A method for testing *Papain* is given on p. 620.

A note on the "*Detection of Lead in Bismuth*," appears on p. 621.

"*Honesty in Advertising*," is commented upon, on p. 629.

A good window-display is described under the title "*A Clever Corn Window*," on p. 645.

"*A New Medical Game*," describes the despicable methods of a Brooklyn Physician in building his practise, which methods were seriously detrimental to the pharmacists of his locality, (p. 628).

The dangers besetting the careless use of *Sulfonal*, are set forth on p. 621.

The possibility of poisoning by *Pineapples*, (p. 621).

"*Blindness following the use of 'Atoxyl'*," (p. 621) is interesting, as this drug has not been generally suspected of any such unfavorable effects.