

for intoxicants, assist in concentrating the business in the hands of a smaller number, some of whom may be less conscientious, and thus add to the difficulties experienced by the Internal Revenue Bureau in preventing abuses?

Furthermore, even assuming that there are none but honest and reputable druggists in a given community, and that, because there is no central dispensing system, a few of them conscientiously determine it to be their duty to shoulder this burden, is it not apparent that if the filling of all the local physicians' prescriptions for stimulants devolves upon a fraction of the number of the local druggists, their business will soon assume a character that will bring them under undeserved suspicion?

I regret that I cannot sympathize at all with those retail druggists who have refused to take out permits to handle or use nonbeverage alcohol as distinguished from whiskey and other beverage forms of spirits. I cannot see how a modern pharmacy can be conducted without the use of alcohol. Of course, a retail druggist may become a peddler of toilet articles, tobacco, stationery, confectionery and soda water, but it seems to me that he must put his professional pride in his pocket and voluntarily scrap a large part of his education as a pharmacist when he decides that he will not use alcohol in any form. Pussfooting should be beneath the dignity of men boasting a scientific training.

To my mind, the retail drug trade in this connection presents a clear case of *noblesse oblige*. Because of the high standing of the educated pharmacist, individually and collectively, it is his duty to assume, in addition to the ordinary burdens of citizenship, the extra load which his intellectual equipment and his special knowledge fit him to carry. He cannot conscientiously sidestep it nor impose it upon another.

If, therefore, you will shoulder your burdens like men and, like men, discharge your obligations to your trade and your country, you will earn the right, whenever your acts are called in question or whenever you find yourselves facing a difficult situation, to come to Washington and, in the tones in which real men speak, demand a square deal at the hands not only of the executive departments but, if necessary, of that august body the Congress of the United States itself.

---

### THE FUTURE OF THE WAR VETERANS' COMMITTEE.\*

BY CLYDE L. EDDY.

The War Veterans' Committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association may well become one of the most important and influential forces in American Pharmacy.

Its members are veterans of a war whose lessons were too well learned ever to be forgotten. They know the steps by which, against its will, this country became involved in the controversy, and, too, they know that conditions might easily arise which would compel us again to take up the sword in defense of our rights as a nation. They know the disadvantages under which pharmacists were compelled to serve in the Army and they know something of the inefficiency which existed for a time in some branches of the service because of a failure to utilize pharmaceutical resources to the best advantage.

---

\* Read before House of Delegates A. Ph. A., City of Washington meeting, 1920.

There are those who will take exception to my statement that there will be wars in the future into which we may be drawn. But those same persons are among those who could not see, even as late as 1916, that there was imminent danger of being drawn into this one. Almost before the guns were cold along the Western front in 1918, the nations of Europe began to make their plans for another war which they consider now to be inevitable and we are not so far removed from Europe that we can afford to ignore what is done by the people living there.

While in France I asked many of the French soldiers and French civilians and German prisoners if they thought there could ever be another war in Europe, and the replies, almost uniformly, were in the affirmative. "Ten years, perhaps," they would answer me, "or fifteen—perhaps fifty—but some time, yes." Those people were not statesmen or generals, but they represented the millions whose wishes ultimately must dictate the actions of their governments and what they said—with the guns of the latest war still ringing in their ears—was said, on the one hand with a tightening of lips and a gleam of implacable hatred in their eyes and, on the other, in a spirit of quiet resignation.

Many times during the war it was said that there never could be another such holocaust—that modern science had rendered such struggles so deadly that the people would not tolerate another one—and yet, travelers who have penetrated the country assure us that Germany, smarting under the most humiliating defeat in the history of the world, is already plotting for revenge. A German reactionary was credited in *The New York Times* of April 18, 1920, with the statement that "We do not hope, we cannot expect, that France will ever go Bolshevik; her small proprietors will save her from that. But there may be trouble—serious trouble—big strikes and transport tie-ups, and maybe outbreaks of anti-militarism and perhaps mutinies. France's allies will leave her—they are doing so already. Why you Americans and English are actually on our side in this dispute. France will grow weaker and we will grow stronger. You cannot keep Germany down. Then one fine day there will be another story. I tell you that within five years a German army will enter Paris." Does that sound as if there can never be another war?

Walter Duranty recently sent the following dispatch from Paris: "The German military party is planning revenge. Not only that—the militarists have already succeeded, despite allied control, in rebuilding their machine for the establishment of a powerful army, whose true strength is concealed by clever camouflage. In other words, the defeated Germany of 1918 is planning to repeat against victorious France the famous coup of Scharnhorst and Stein in the years after Jena against Napoleon. That is the inevitable conclusion of what I have seen and heard in a recent visit to Frankfort in occupied Germany, and to both the Red and White sectors of the Ruhr Valley."

Mr. Duranty submitted the following facts to prove the truth of his statements and the soundness of his conclusions:

1. The German military party, headed by Ludendorf and a camarilla of generals and aided by the *Deutsch Offizier Bund* of Berlin and a thousand similar organizations throughout the country, is striving by might and main for revenge.
2. They have already reorganized a military machine and created a powerful army on a new basis.
3. They have succeeded in part in restoring the morale of the old army.

4. They induced Noske, either wittingly or unwittingly, to cooperate in their work and to assist them in concealing it from the allies.
  5. Since Noske's resignation they are practically masters of the German government.
  6. They are taking the utmost pains to hide the real extent of their efforts and their aims from the allied control commission.
  7. They are using the danger of an attempt by the extremists to institute a proletariat dictatorship, a danger which is real enough, as an excuse to account for and a screen to cover their own preparations.
- and so forth.

Later, the same paper called attention, editorially, to the fact that

"All the elaborate fiction of liberalism with which the German Government has sought to convince the world outside of Germany—and France—has been shattered into bits by that Government's own confession that 'the army would not accept an order for its dissolution.' In other words, the army is the Government, and the Socialist-Democratic-Center officials who hold the offices are merely a set of dummies whom the army finds convenient for dealing with foreign governments. That some of these dummies do not know that they are dummies, and that most of them would prefer not to be dummies, is beside the point. They can exercise the functions of government in Germany only so far as they do not interfere with the army; when that time comes, the 'liberal' government under Ebert is either unable or unwilling to go further."

It is not necessary for me to call your attention to other evidences of Germany's lack of good faith and to her expressed intention to revenge herself upon France and, later, the other allies. Nor is it my intention to point to Germany as the only potential disturber of the peace of the world. The evidence is before us, however (the same kind of evidence at which France and England and, especially, America scoffed prior to 1914) and we who saw this latest war at first hand have a solemn duty to perform in urging upon our associates the danger of another such struggle and the desirability—the necessity—of being prepared for it when it comes.

Also, there is danger from within. We have watched the spread of bolshevism in Russia and have said to ourselves in a reassuring manner that such a movement cannot possibly make itself felt in this enlightened country and yet—it is making itself felt and there is abundant evidence to prove that there is a widespread and well organized movement on foot to undermine the very foundations of our government. We are riding on the crest of a wave of prosperity such as the world has never seen before and the tenets of bolshevism thrive but poorly when stomachs are full and pay rolls are fat. But, do we know what lies in wait for us in the trough of the wave on which we are riding?

Albert J. Beveridge said recently at Atlantic City that there would be ten or fifteen million idle persons in the United States two years from now. "We are coming upon a period of unemployment that will be terrible," he said. "I speak not only from my own knowledge but upon the testimony of the leading experts of the land when I say that in less than two years there will be from ten to fifteen millions of people in this country out of employment." Perhaps there is a political motive in Mr. Beveridge's statement, but there may be much of accurate prophecy in it as well, and what will be the proportions of this bolshevist movement in the hard times that he says are coming if it is so important a factor in our national life to-day when jobs are plentiful?

I know how little we are interested in these things as we go about our daily

tasks. To many of us Europe is only a name and we are interested but little in the news that comes from there. We brand as "calamity howlers" those who tell us that there is danger of our being disturbed in our comfortable modes of living and pay little heed to what they say. I was trout fishing on the Feather River, in California, when the German troops invaded Belgium in 1914 and I remember how impersonal was my interest at first in that hideous maelstrom of war which engulfed all of Europe before the end of the year and sucked down to death 70,000 of my own buddies over there before it was ended. That is the trouble—we care too little—we go about our businesses all unconcerned until the blow is struck and then, all in a moment—without training—without preparation—we are compelled to defend our homes and our sacred institutions with our very lives.

No other members of the profession had the opportunity that we, who served in the Army or Navy during the war, had to see conditions as they existed in the service and no one is better equipped than we to point out to the profession why its resources were not made better use of and to show it what should be done so that there never will be a repetition of the unpleasant experiences of 1917 and 1918.

We know that there were instances where men who know absolutely nothing about pharmacy were entrusted with pharmaceutical duties while trained pharmacists were compelled to drive motor trucks, construct barracks and carry mail. We know that many pharmacists went into branches of the service where their pharmaceutical training was of absolutely no use to them—or to the Army—because they were told that their services—as pharmacists—were not available. We know that hospital duties were entrusted to inexperienced men detailed from the ranks and that those duties could better have been performed by men trained in pharmacy. There are times when the best that an untrained man can do is not good enough—good intentions, alone, do not save life or ameliorate pain.

We know that hundreds of physicians were kept busy doing work which pharmacists could have done as well, thereby relieving those physicians for more important work in the hospitals or at dressing stations. Those of us who were in France saw the civil population of the country almost bereft of physicians because of a too profligate expenditure of this important resource during the early years of the war.

It is not my intention to infer that the Medical Department alone failed in some instances to utilize its available men and materials to the best advantage because I know that other branches of the service fumbled as well in their efforts to meet an unprecedented emergency without adequate preparation for it, but I do maintain that conditions could have been improved and that pharmaceutical aid could and should have been utilized to better advantage.

The War Veterans' Committee should constitute itself a sort of "preparedness" section of American Pharmacy. Its chairman should prepare, each year, a comprehensive report showing the status of pharmacy as a *military resource*. He should get in touch with the Surgeon-General of the Army and of the Navy and ascertain their wants. He should learn from them what sort of training best fits a man for military service in their departments and then make an effort to have the colleges include that sort of training in their curricula. He should

familiarize himself with the work of the Navy Hospital Corps and the Army Medical Administrative Corps and endeavor to bring about some degree of coordination between those branches of the service and the pharmacy colleges.

He should learn exactly to which schools the War Department might turn if it has sudden and urgent need for bacteriologists, explosive chemists, chemists for chemical warfare service, manufacturing chemists and other men with similar specialized training. The schools should be urged to give adequate courses in first aid and other subjects which might fit their students for service in the Army. The idea of preparedness for war should never again be lost sight of in our colleges.

It would be no great task each year to compile a list of pharmacists and pharmaceutical chemists *outside of the schools* whose services might be of particular value in time of war and, also, the report could include a description of the commercial and manufacturing resources which the profession might turn to useful account in case of need.

This report—and it could be made to include many things not mentioned here—should be presented each year to the association and to the Surgeons-General of the Army and Navy. It would include information which they, perhaps, could not get in any other way, and such a series of reports, reaching these officers every twelve months, could not fail to impress them favorably. No doubt the reports would be filed away each year and, perhaps, forgotten, but the *effect* would be there—their influence would remain to impress the officers with the fact that American Pharmacy has possibilities they knew nothing of and that the training given to pharmacy students is more thorough than they realized. And, finally, there will come the year when the report will not be filed away and forgotten but, instead, will be used as the basis for the mobilization of the profession and, even if that time does not come for forty years, the work of the intervening decades will not have been in vain.

---

#### A NEW BUSINESS CONSCIENCE.

The philosophically inclined were wont to discuss, while the great conflict was going on, the probability of a new business conscience among the other new things which were to be a product of war's crucible. Seemingly, the thought was that dealings between man and man were to be on a higher plane. It was a worthy thought and it has not been forgotten. But unfortunately it seems to have lost the emphasis which the times should place upon it. No matter how fair-minded business men are, nor how zealously they hew to the line, the ideal must ever remain afar off. It is true that in this sphere of endeavor, as in all moral departments of life, that which is most worth while is most difficult to attain. In view of some of the unsavory revelations which have grown out of inquiries into profiteering, it were well for the vast mass of honorable business men—the dishonorable ones are infinitesimal in number—to hitch their wagons to the stars, even at the cost of superhuman effort, that the world of trade might wipe out quickly the stigma which the few have placed upon it.

Taking them all in all, the business men of the nation represent one of its greatest moral forces for good. They need not bow their heads in shame. They have stood up under the most trying conditions and fought their way to high ground over obstacles that sometimes seemed insurmountable. The spirit which has actuated them should become increasingly strong. By their continued example they will compel emulation among those inclined to shady methods, or failing in this they will make the trickster so uncomfortable that he must pack up and quit.—*Editorial, "New York Commercial," June 15, 1920.*