

has published a letter in which he expresses his astonishment in seeing that Dr. Bouchard does not mention those who had previously carried out experiments on this very subject. He then quotes a passage from his work on "Diseases of the Stomach," p. 269, in which he refers to the use of drugs locally, and to the possibility of using small, minute doses in such cases. It yet remains to be seen how Professor Bouchard will accept this from Professor Robin, who is a younger man, and who has not the weight nor the universal reputation of the disciple of Charcot.

#### Lannelongue and Landouzy Decorated by the Emperor of Germany.

Professors Lannelongue and Landouzy, who attended the recent congress of tuberculosis held in Berlin, have been favored with the insignia of knights of the Royal Order of the Crown of Prussia.

#### Pasteur's Monument in Paris.

The site for Pasteur's monument has not yet been chosen definitely. It was to have been erected on the Place de Medecis opposite the Pantheon, then near the Sorbonne, lastly in the Avenue de Breteuil, opposite the dome of the Invalides. When work on the foundations was to be started it was found that the view of the Invalides might be interfered with on account of the height of the monument, so that the definite site remains an unsettled question.

### Correspondence.

#### Dr. Croftan's Iodin Starch Test for Adrenal Extract.

CHICAGO, Jan. 29, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—Dr. S. P. Kramer, under the above caption (THE JOURNAL, Jan. 24, p. 257), mentions the fact that a series of organ extracts and ferment solutions other than adrenal or hypernephroma extract possess the power of decolorizing iodine starch solution. The inference is that this test is, therefore, of no value in the differentiation of adrenal tumors of the kidney from other tumors of this organ.

That the preparations enumerated by Dr. Kramer can decolorize iodine starch solution is known to me. The decolorization is, however, by no means so prompt nor so complete. I could supplement his list by a considerable number of other bodies with reducing properties that can do the same. The practical value of the hypernephroma test is not, however, impaired hereby. For, as I took pains to determine and as I expressly mentioned in my "Note," no other normal or abnormal constituent of the *kidneys* gives this test. It is hardly probable that the surgeon or pathologist will look for "Thyroid (P. D. & Co.), thymus (Armour), extract of meat (Liebig), pepsin (Fairchild), or pancreatic extract (Dry)" when attempting to identify a tumor of the kidney. None of these commercial products, moreover, give the other tests for adrenal tissue that I have described, with the exception of thyroid gland that may occasionally produce glycosuria, and pancreas that possesses diastatic powers.

I should advise Dr. Kramer to write me first hereafter before jumping into print with a criticism that is so misleading to the casual reader. ALFRED C. CROFTAN.

#### The Nobel Prizes, the Carnegie Institute, and the Promotion of Scientific Research.

CHICAGO, Jan. 26, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—The beneficiaries of the Nobel fund receive \$40,000 as a reward for past achievement; the beneficiaries of the Carnegie fund, according to the last report of the "Institution," are to receive "not more than \$1,000 a year" as an incentive to future achievement. The recipients of the Nobel prizes have arrived at the zenith of their scientific career and, presumably, do not need this stipend. The recipients of the Carnegie money are expected some day to climb to equal heights, presumably with the aid of a thousand dollars a year.

It is stated expressly that the men who are made beneficiaries of the Carnegie Institution must have shown "particular aptitude for the prosecution of original investigations," must be willing to devote all their time to advance research, and must agree to publish nothing without the approval of the Carnegie

directors. In return they are to receive an emolument that approximately equals the salary of a policeman, a letter carrier or a street-car conductor.

It seems altogether improbable that any man who has really had an opportunity to show particular aptitude for original research will avail himself of this pittance under these conditions. It all depends on what we agree to understand by aptitude for original investigation. Much work passes for original research that is merely descriptive in character. The fact that a certain self-evident phenomenon has not been investigated and published heretofore may very well signify that no one has so far considered this particular fact or phenomenon worth investigating. Nine-tenths of the "research" that floods our journals consists of just such work, and constitutes in no way the solution of any problem that seems to urgently call for solution. The pathologist describes a tumor of the brain—this particular tumor, it is true, may never have been described before, but a thousand others like it have been described and redescribed; the physiologist measures the contractions of the unstriped muscles of the cat's bladder; the anatomist describes one of the thousand possible abnormalities in the course of the colon; the bacteriologist finds a new microbe in the shrimp, and bestows on it a long name, et cetera ad nauseam. This is not research. This is carrying the hod and carting bricks. True, some one must do this work, and it is well that some one should be doing it. The value of such investigations, however, is exactly on a par with the work of a corps of surveyors in a hitherto unsurveyed territory, or with the first reports of a gang of fire inspectors in regard to the architecture of this, that or the other of a thousand buildings. What we need are constructive geniuses, minds that can make this heterogeneous conglomerate of disconnected facts the basis of some new conclusions; minds that, standing on such a fundament, can see far and beyond and can tell us what they see. Such men are rare; such men have shown a particular aptitude for research; such men receive the Nobel prizes, and such men are not for sale for \$1,000 a year.

Even those young workers who, under the direction of a competent teacher of technic and a prolific purveyor of "ideas" and "problems," are willing to comply with the rules of the Carnegie Institution are ultimately damaged in their career. Assuming them, *exempli causa*, to be medical men, then three fields of activity stand open—practice, teaching, research. No one man can very well achieve great things in all three fields; it is quite feasible, however, for a man to practice or to teach and still find time to do creditable research work besides. It must be a poor practitioner and a poor teacher indeed who cannot command \$1,000 a year by the time he is "particularly apt." Twenty laboratories are open to a man with such ambitions in this country, and fifty more abroad, where he will be received with open arms. While carrying on his research he is building up his practice or establishing his reputation as a teacher. The victim of the Carnegie munificence, as administered by the Carnegie directors, can do neither—he simply researches—and in so doing he gambles with his time; for unless he is investigating some phenomenon that is so patent that he *must* get some results—and such phenomena are manifestly not worth investigating at a sacrifice—he may find at the expiration of a year or of two years that the results of his investigation are *nil* or negative, for the reason that his or his chief's working hypothesis was wrong; this happens a thousand times in all laboratories. One might as well say to a promising young man with a philosophic bent of intellect: "Here, young man, is \$1,000. This will enable you to eat for a year. Now show your particular aptitude for philosophy; philosophize for the term of your fellowship (subject to the approval of the Carnegie directors) and become an Emerson." Or, "Here, young friend, you have occasionally broken out into poetry; take this thousand, agree to do nothing else but follow your Muse, and become a Longfellow, to the glory of the Carnegie Institution." We do not think that an Emerson, a Longfellow, a Newton, nor a Lavoisier has ever been lost to this world for the lack of a thousand a year. A true

investigator can not be repressed, nor can he be created by relieving him, in a fashion, at the outset of his career of the most acute responsibilities incident to keeping his body and soul together.

What the Carnegie Institution promises to furnish by its research fellowships are technical assistants to a few men in this country who are already at the head of well-equipped laboratories and who, if they have any inspiration in their own souls, should be, and are, surrounded by a corps of inspired and enthusiastic volunteer workers. The stipend of "not more than \$1,000" will attract few constructive geniuses to such positions.

What we need, apparently, is a Mæcenas of Science who will not bestow a fortune on the successful worker when he is resting on his laurels and when he no longer needs support; and who will not offer a pittance so miserable that it is barely sufficient to keep body and soul together to the struggling youth—with possibilities—who is reaching for his laurels; but who will endow the investigator in the full vigor of his working manhood, and after he has had an opportunity to show his contemporaries that he is really "particularly adapted to prosecute original investigation," with a sum of money sufficiently large to enable him to live decently and comfortably and thus to carry out unhindered by financial worries the work that he may reasonably be expected to accomplish for the good of humanity.

ALFRED C. CROFTAN.

## Queries and Minor Notes.

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS will not be noticed. Queries for this column must be accompanied by the writer's name and address, but the request of the writer not to publish his name will be faithfully observed.

### FORMALIN INJECTIONS FOR SEPTICEMIA.

LISBON, IOWA, Jan. 30, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—On page 253, January 24, in "Formalin Injections for Septicemia," do you state the proportions correctly? If not, will it not be the means of causing deaths in patients of physicians who rely on it being correct? I have used formalin in a case where I was called as consultant in puerperal septicemia and the patient seems to be slowly convalescing. I used 500 c.c. of a 1 to 5,000 solution of formalin—in median basilic vein of one arm one day and the same amount in same vein of the other arm the next day.

E. BURD.

*Ans.*—On consulting our correspondent, we find that the strength should have been stated as 1 to 5,000. A case is reported in which the use of a 1 to 2,500 solution caused collapse, but McGuire (*London Lancet*, Dec. 1, 1900) used a strength of 1 to 800 on himself without serious results. This illustrates the uncertainty of the effects of these injections and emphasizes the necessity of extreme care. Especial attention is called to the Editorial in this issue.

### PRACTICE IN ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

MINNEAPOLIS, Jan. 26, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—Will you kindly inform me through your columns of the requirements for practice of medicine in Arizona and New Mexico? To whom can I write for further information? S. E. S.

*Ans.*—The medical practice law of Arizona requires the passage of an examination by the board and an approved diploma. The present status of the law is a little uncertain as it has very recently been declared unconstitutional by a local court. Whether the case will be carried higher, we can not say. In New Mexico all but the graduates of eight medical colleges will have to pass an examination. The institutions whose diplomas exempt from examination are the following universities: Pennsylvania, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Columbia of New York, Missouri, Yale, Michigan and Minnesota. Dr. W. G. Hope, Albuquerque, N. M., is the Secretary of the New Mexico Board of Health, and Dr. Wm. Duffield, Phoenix, Ariz., is the Secretary of the Arizona Board of Medical Examiners.

### THE PHYSICIAN AND THE PHARMACOPEIA—METHOD OF REDUCING STRENGTH OF SOLUTIONS.

DES MOINES, IOWA, Jan. 30, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—Another example of how ignorant competent physicians are of the U. S. Pharmacopeia is evident in Dr. Hardcastle's statement published in your issue of January 24. The Doctor's "Method of Reducing Strength of Solutions" is the one explained, adopted, and used by the U. S. P. This is the official rule for making all dilutions. (See U. S. P. on acids, alcohol, etc.)

ELI GRIMES.

### COW-POX SERUM INJECTIONS.

Jan. 28, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—Has the serum of a cow suffering from vaccinia ever been injected into a patient afflicted with smallpox; if so, with what result? I have never read of any such experiments in my limited supply of literature.

H. L. F.

*Ans.*—We have not seen any record of such experiments. Would not this be an interesting field for investigation?

### TRAINED MALE NURSES.

736 HUDSON AVE., ST. PAUL, MINN., Jan. 29, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—I am interested in becoming a trained nurse, but do not know what to do or where to go. Can you kindly inform me? Is the male nurse in demand? I would like some Eastern school if I could.

FRANK KODA.

### CASE OF CONGENITAL MEASLES.

BENTLEY, ILL., Jan. 26, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—I wish to report the birth of a child Jan. 23, 1903, with the measles in eruption. The mother's eruption began Jan. 16, 1903, after tardy prodrome. Both doing well.

Very Truly, F. S. AGLER, M.D.

### WANTS A SEQUARIAN LAMP.

LINTON, IND., Jan. 24, 1903.

*To the Editor:*—Where can I obtain a Sequarian lamp?

M. N. THAYER.

## Marriages.

JOHN H. RINDLAUB, M.D., to Miss Marie Douglas, both of Fargo, N. D., January 31.

LOUIS A. GAUDIN, M.D., Convent, La., to Miss Louise Ilsley of New Orleans, January 21.

FRED SCRIVER SPEARMAN, M.D., to Miss Olive L. Pooler, both of Hawkeye, Iowa, Nov. 7, 1902.

J. ABNER PENTON, M.D., Goodwater, Ala., to Miss Mildred Parker of Equality, Ala., January 27.

LUTHER HAYS, M.D., Cullman, Ala., to Miss Ethel Olivia Watson of Vinemont, Ala., January 20.

JOHN DOUGLAS, M.D., Florence, Ala., to Miss Marguerite Pearl Burford of Birmingham, January 28.

CHARLES DICKENS WILLIAMS, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio, to Miss Annie Martin of Lisbon, Ohio, January 28.

JOHN L. WORCESTER, M.D., Birmingham, Ala., to Miss Elizabeth Blakeslee of Kansas City, January 28.

WILLIAM C. BLOOMER, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio, to Maud McCounghey of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, January 19.

EDGAR K. WARD, M.D., Park City, Utah, to Miss Myrtle Hale of San Francisco, at Salt Lake City, January 15.

T. A. JONES, M.D., Springfield, S. C., to Miss Annie E. Sawyer of Sawyerdale, S. C., at Perry, S. C., Dec. 17, 1902.

WILLIAM O. POWELL, M.D., Mackinaw, Ill., to Mrs. M. Louise Coney of Bloomington, Ill., in Chicago, January 21.

PEDER S. BRUGUIERE, M.D., San Francisco, to Miss Maryan Andrews of Pine Knoll, Cal., at Reno, Nev., Dec. 21, 1902.

JOHN W. BRAMLETT, M.D., Campobello, S. C., to Miss Eva Wilkes of Chester, S. C., at Spartanburg, S. C., January 26.

I. R. SHUMAN, M.D., Wagon Mound, N. M., to Miss Elizabeth C. Gotwats of Norristown, Pa., at Santa Fe, N. M., Oct. 4, 1902.

## Deaths.

Eugene Foster, M.D. Medical College of Augusta (Ga.), 1872, a member of the American Medical Association; professor of practice of medicine and sanitary science and dean of the faculty of the medical department of the University of Georgia; president of the Georgia Medical Society in 1885; president of the Richmond County Medical Association in 1890; member of the New York Medicolegal Society; member of the American Public Health Association; member of the American Surgical Association; president of the board of trustees of the Georgia State Sanitarium; president of the Augusta Board of Health for twenty-five years, and one of the most prominent and highly-esteemed physicians of the state, died at his home in Augusta, January 23, after an illness of three months, from