

EDITORIAL

E. G. EBERLE, Editor

253 Bourse Bldg., PHILADELPHIA

THE DOCTORS AND THE DRUG ADDICTS.

AN editorial under above caption appeared in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* of April 11, 1919:

"If the estimates of the health commissioner of New York City are to be accepted as even approaching accuracy, there are between 100,000 and 200,000 drug addicts in that city, victims of the criminal cupidity of a handful of disreputable physicians and druggists. A number of the doctors said to have been engaged in this traffic have been arrested, and an earnest effort is to be made not only to root out the evil but to deal humanely with the victims deprived of their usual narcotic by the arrests.

"This action of the New York authorities, in conjunction with officers of the Internal Revenue Service, is a forerunner of what will have to be done all over the country when the national prohibition laws go into effect. There can be no doubt that the drug habit on the part of those deprived of alcoholic stimulants will be enormously increased and that new measures will have to be taken to meet and combat an evil quite as serious as that against which the prohibition movement is directed. The federal and state laws regulating the sale of narcotics have made it more difficult for addicts to obtain the drugs for which they crave; but they have also enormously increased the incentive to violate the regulations.

"An enormous responsibility is placed upon the medical profession by these regulations, for it is chiefly by the connivance of unscrupulous doctors that addicts can obtain access to the forbidden drugs. Under these circumstances, it is incumbent upon the medical societies of the country to render the fullest coöperation to the end that the honor of the profession may be protected and the nation preserved from a scourge more deadly even than the drink evil. They may find it expedient to make radical modifications in their code of ethics, and especially in those rules governing the secrecy of the relations between the doctor and the criminal patient, for it is under the cover of that secrecy that the worst forms of malpractice flourish. That the laws must be made more strict than at present is probable; but the strictest law is not self-enforcing. The medical profession and the drug trade must rid themselves of the reproach of being the vehicle for and of taking toll from the perpetuation of a practice ruinous to health and morals and a growing menace to public safety."

Every drug addict should receive medical treatment. Few of them persist in efforts for the riddance of the affliction and practically all of them are easily persuaded to follow advice that causes them little or no inconvenience, hence, they are easy prey for medicasters. The place for drug addicts is in State institutions for the cure of the addiction. The drug addict receives little sympathy; he is entitled to much, for not infrequently he is victim, not transgressor, and by the time he becomes aware of his unfortunate condition he has lost control over self, and should be in charge of the State.

The purpose of the comment on the editorial, however, is to affirm that "the medical profession and the drug trade must rid themselves of the reproach of being the vehicle for and of taking toll from perpetuation of a practice ruinous to health and morals and a growing menace to public safety." It is a matter of deep concern that a handful of disreputables should bring reproach on the professions of medicine and pharmacy. It is time for closer coöperation between these

professions; an attitude which hinders the members in giving the best service is not just to the public.

We quote the following from an editorial of a recent issue of *Medical Council*:

"The druggist has been obliged to cater to demand, and the demand has been a matter largely beyond his control. He could not afford to stock goods he could not sell, and he could sell little but that which has been persistently advertised or that catered to public convenience or appetite."

We add, that the demand has often been created by prescriptions. That this is recognized is evident from the same editorial, the closing paragraphs of which read: "Treat the druggist as you would have him treat you, and perhaps a great many drug store abuses will soon be quickly righted; for the druggist is commonly just as good a man as you are.

"Don't try to oblige the fellow who wants liquor by asking the druggist to fill pint prescriptions for it, for the reputable druggist does not want that sort of business."

If the increase in drug addiction which has been reported from states where prohibition laws have become effective is a criterion, then the seriousness of the situation after July 1 becomes apparent.

The public has a right to expect and investigate the coöperation of professions, and to determine whether they are giving it the best service and protection possible. There is not only a widening field of medical science before us in which medicine and pharmacy should find much to do, but there are growing responsibilities in which they jointly share. The application of the Golden Rule in genuine service is possible only when the value of human life and health is placed above class distinction and material gain.

E. G. E.

PENDING ASSOCIATION WORK FOR PHARMACISTS AND PHARMACY.

WAR conditions of last year interfered largely with association attendance; this year's conventions are to be Victory conclaves, the announcements for them are trumpet calls to duty. Never has there been so much legislation to discuss, so many radical changes in business affairs to consider, and important organization matters that demand attention.

Nineteen twenty is the centennial anniversary of the U. S. Pharmacopoeia; the first edition was published in 1820; the eleventh Pharmacopoeial convention will assemble in Washington in May of next year. While the Pharmacopoeia now in force is the ninth revision, it is the tenth edition; the title U. S. Pharmacopoeia X. would be correct and, perhaps, less confusing than the present designation.

State pharmaceutical associations should nominate their delegates to the Pharmacopoeial Convention this year as next year's meetings will, in most instances, be held after the first week of May. The selection of delegates is deserving of most

careful inquiry; there is much work to be done preparatory to a revision in which American drugs and chemicals will receive more consideration than heretofore. The chairman of the Revision Committee is Prof. Charles H. LaWall, whose address is 39 So. 10th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. The president of the Pharmacopoeial Convention is Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, Washington, D C.

Preparations will be made for the fifth edition of the National Formulary, at the New York Convention of the American Pharmaceutical Association. The revisions of these standards are of great moment to pharmacy in its various divisions, but there are other significant promotions that demand serious deliberations; not the least among these is the closer affiliation of State associations with the American Pharmaceutical Association in the House of Delegates. The need of united endeavor has been impressed and to neglect the opportunity, with the lesson so fresh in our memories, can be viewed only as unmindfulness of our own duties to ourselves and pharmacy. Chairman H. V. Army, of the Federation Committee, has sent the messages of that active committee to the various associations; they should be given close study and made subjects for discussions and the conclusions reached should be conveyed to the House of Delegates by instructed representatives. The associations have also received printed copies of the transactions of the Chicago meeting of the House of Delegates, through Secretary Jeannot Hostmann.

The hopes of American men of science are for the establishment of a monumental research institute. The coöperation of the American Pharmaceutical Association and of the American Medical Association is essential in this work. The importance of pharmaceutical research is apparent to everyone and recently has been the subject of frequent editorial comments and papers in this JOURNAL. In this issue we reprint instead "A few comments on the proposed Institute for Drug Research" from the Chicago Chemical Bulletin for April:

A FEW COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED INSTITUTE FOR DRUG RESEARCH.

"The proposed Institute for Drug Research has become current topic to readers of *The Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry*. The proposal, as far as it embodies a happy compatibility between commercial and altruistic aims, is indeed worthy of the American Chemical Society. *The Bulletin* has refrained from taking a definite stand, but this in no way will hinder it from presenting its reflections. *The Bulletin* simply feels hesitant about recommending or condemning a project which has such potentialities either for good—or for harm.

"The chief agitators for the Institute for Drug Research appear to be influential members of the New York Section. Much praise is undoubtedly due them for endeavoring to create real work for real chemists. This must be the main object of the plan. Furthermore, the avowed intentions to keep Germany from regaining her former supremacy in synthetic drugs sold in America are accentuated by a practical form of patriotism. Increased American drug manufacture would also aid in more firmly re-entrenching the dye industry; by-products of the color works appeal to the investor as a legitimate means of necessary remunerative returns.

"Has the situation been handled in a manner productive of the best results? We grant the excellence of the above premises; we note carefully the post-war 'key' in this enterprise as in many other national undertakings; the open sesame that bares the objects of the Institute

to the glory of 'humanity.' With all these commendable expressions, why do the promoters not rise to a plane of true altruism and propose that the Institute be a coöperative agency, actually unifying the best elements of chemistry, pharmacy, and medicine? What good purpose or what logic is served in the insistence on keeping the Institute rigidly under the control of the American Chemical Society? The American Pharmaceutical Association admits that it has not been successful in fostering 'Pharmaceutical Research.' The American Medical Association seemingly has not deemed it wise of itself to promulgate a coöperative quasi-commercial proposition. Yet the views of organized chemistry as reflected through the national journal convey the impression that the Institute under the chemists' trusteeship will assuredly be a success—being chemists we are endowed with an exceptional acumen.

"The really big thing is to create a recognized research center not controlled by any one group or element; an institute whose policies are formulated by men of experience in the various affiliated branches of medico-chemical sciences and willingly seek the advice of all coöperative agencies. The American Pharmaceutical Association or the American Medical Association cannot *by themselves* create a successful research establishment, but their help is essential. Cannot the American Chemical Society fulfill the manifest need for a drug-investigating laboratory by magnanimously utilizing its organs as the means of crystallizing the movement, irrespective of whether the latter remains under its total jurisdiction. Public health demands that evidence of supreme bigness out of which will rise a recognized national seat for critical drug research stripped of all professional or commercial pettishness and not dominated by any one group of scientists.

"The practical weakness of the propaganda has been the utter disregard of the attitude of physicians. It is necessary to remind the Eastern chemists that the whole fabric will disintegrate if the doctors do not receive seriously the pronuncio of all organized chemists' agency. The medical viewpoint is more essential for success than the combined laboratory arguments. Test-tube and animal experiments are of undoubted merit, but the average physician wants to know the total results of accurately controlled clinical tests. These can only be obtained with the close coöperation of the medical profession. The *Bulletin* has been surprised at the seeming disregard of organized medicine in the several meetings which have been held to discuss this subject and in the published opinions. Organized pharmacy has been consulted in some slight measure; but the absence of an official representation of the American Medical Association is at least surprising. Yet it is no secret that that Association has maintained since 1905 a Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry whose primary purpose is 'gathering and disseminating such information as will protect the medical profession in the prescribing of proprietary medicinal articles.' Surely the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry (whose personnel needs no introduction) has a much keener grasp of the synthetic drug situation than the Mellon Institute or even the Rockefeller Institute, although the aid of the latter institutions should be very welcome.

"Even before 1914 American physicians were gradually freeing therapeutic measures from the overburden of numerous German synthetics and their numberless modifications. The demand had been artificially stimulated by clever advertising, especially in days before the profession could call on such men as Stieglitz, Long, Sollman, Hatcher, Hunt, Howland, Puckner, and others, for unprejudiced opinions on the efficacy of so-claimed wonderful chemical 'discoveries.' As the war progressed, the stocks of German-made drugs were gradually diminished; the shortage was felt considerably in only a few instances. The medical profession, as a whole, is more than grateful to be rid of most of these unessential drugs. To-day apparently no shortage exists, although only about a dozen formerly German-made synthetics are being manufactured here on a commercial scale. Due recognition has undoubtedly been accorded the American chemists for achievements of preparing the needed remedies—no easy task. The American chemist can only retain his warm feeling toward him by refraining from flooding the market with semi-scientific medicaments. To follow the footsteps of the Germans is to be misled. The synthesizing of chemicals—actuated solely by a commercial desire to capitalize by-products at the expense of unfortunate victims of sickness—is to be deprecated by all sincere thinking chemists. On the other hand, the improvement of well-known drugs, the seeking of new means of alleviation of disease, the discarding of pseudo-scientific theories of drug action can be done only in an institute such as has been outlined by some of the promoters, and freed from factional or predatory influence.

"Congratulations are due the American Chemical Society for the high type of men appointed on the committee for this proposed institute. Dr. John Abel, of New York, has made many valuable contributions to pharmacology and is an earnest scholar. Dr. Raymond Bacon, of Pittsburgh, enjoys considerable popularity, largely because of his influential executive affiliation at the Mellon Institute. The chief of the scientific staff of Eli Lilly & Co., Dr. Eldred, represents a pioneer drug firm of the Middle West. The selection of Dr. Charles Herty, of New York, the editor of our industrial journal, as chairman, is logical. Dr. Reid Hunt, Boston, formerly director of the Hygienic Laboratory, U. S. Public Health Service, possesses both a thorough knowledge of chemo-therapeutics and a most excellently balanced mind. Professor Treat Johnson, New Haven, Conn., has created an enviable reputation in organic research. Dr. F. A. Levene, Rockefeller Institute, New York, is well known in the fields of physiologic-chemistry, not only as a result of his own investigations, but also those of his able collaborators. The eighth member, Mr. F. O. Taylor, Detroit, has published articles on pharmacy, and is connected with the house of Parke, Davis & Co. The personnel argues well for the success of the propaganda, and any criticism which might be offered is that there is a lack of well-known and recognized pharmaceutical chemists. The statements in favor of the Institute have been well brought out in the *Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry*, and none should doubt the ultimate value to America of research stimulation. The wisdom, foresight, and courage which the committee possesses may be the means of finding a happy solution for the erection of a monumental research institute. Such are the hopes of American men of science."

PHARMACY, EDUCATION, AND SECTIONS IN PHARMACY.*

BY JOHN URI LLOYD, PHAR. M.

The Pharmacist.—According to the general definition of the word, a pharmacist is a maker or compounder of substances that are intended to be used as medicines. He may either delve deeply into the sciences that contribute to his art, or he may practically neglect them and still claim to be a pharmacist. He may either spend his spare time (for many pharmacists have leisure hours) in study or experimentation, or he may squander it in numerous directions that profit neither the mind nor the purse. In this article the term pharmacist is to be divorced from the lower of these connections and applied only to those persons who, as students, view their calling in the light of an exacting study, whether it be in immethodical experimentation or in systematic science research.

Natural Laws Dominate Pharmacy.—In this sense the conditions that control the physicist in his investigations concerning the various states of matter, become of vital importance to the thoughtful pharmacist as well. The investigations that have been made, and the studies yet to be made with liquids, solids, and gases, are a part of his heritage. The laws evolved by the study of chemistry, optics, physics, and especially physical chemistry, affiliate with the researches made and yet to be made in pharmacy fields.

It should not be forgotten, therefore, that in compounding pharmaceutical preparations, the laws that govern scientists generally must be considered, and that recondite phenomena in the broadest sense may be recognized if the operators

* At the request of Dr. Charles Rice, in the latter part of the last century (1894), I wrote the first volume of a treatise entitled "A Study in Pharmacy." This work, comprising two hundred and twelve pages, was put into type and presented in fascicles, privately, to a limited circle of friends likely to be interested in the problems embraced therein. Otherwise, publication was not ventured. May I not hope that after its twenty-five years of slumber, this fragment, seemingly yet pertinent, may not prove a cumberer to pharmaceutical literature? J. U. L.