

EDITORIAL

E. G. EBERLE, Editor

253 Bourse Bldg., PHILADELPHIA

THE PROBLEMS OF PHARMACY.

ALL trades and professions have their problems, many of which also concern pharmacists, because of the interrelation of pharmacy. President E. Saville Peck, of the British Pharmaceutical Conference, in his annual address discusses British Pharmacy and its possibilities; his hopes are not so different from those that have been expressed by American pharmacists. He has given careful study to the organization of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the closely related bodies; his viewpoint is that of an eclectic, and his conclusions are reached and applications are made with a precognition that the practice of British and American pharmacy differs in some respects. It is very evident, however, that in England, as in the United States, there has been a desire and still a recognition of the difficulty to draw a distinct line between what is "commercial" pharmacy and what is professional; furthermore, neither here nor there is it generally admitted that the depreciation of pharmacy is entirely due to the fact that its practice is for the most part carried on "behind a counter" in "an open shop." President Peck does not differentiate between a trade and a profession nor does he contend that one is more worthy, desirable or honorable than the other. He states: "It can well be said that many so-called professional men carry on their profession in a purely commercial spirit, while many so-called tradesmen bring professional instincts to bear upon their business."

It is pleasing to note that many of the comments, suggestions and proposals of the address are not so very different from the plans which have been formulated by the American Pharmaceutical Association; some activated, others still in the formative period. We present several of the concluding paragraphs:

"Pharmacy, if it is to progress, will have to move forward with advance of general education and of applied science."

"If it is to take up its position with other professional bodies it must bring its final qualification up to University and Continental standards. If we cannot differentiate between the druggist and the dispensing pharmacist, we can at least endeavor to evolve a higher type of pharmacist on the lines suggested."

"In British pharmacy to-day there is need for a closer union of purpose, counsel and activity of all those who are working for a full realization of the profession of pharmacy."

"One of my dreams is of a central unifying association which shall bring together and coördinate those forces of which I have been speaking. The union of these forces—education, qualification, research, and professional conduct—should result in the evolution of a real profession of pharmacy, which, coexistent and interdependent with medicine, should work for the advancement of the health of the great nation to which we belong."

We quote the following from a recent editorial of *Clinical Medicine*: "Life is a series of adjustments. This is one of the greatest, most important, most far-reaching facts in human existence. The laws of nature function all about us and we cannot change them. Hence, to be in harmony with them, we must adjust ourselves to them." This is applicable to the development of pharmacy; we may desire to shape it to suit our aims and ideals, but public viewpoint and environment must be reckoned with.

The service pharmacy renders should be brought to the attention of the people, and therein the influence pharmacists can exert relative to many questions is

important. The doctors' duties include direction of the public to the end that laws of health, etc., are observed. In this pharmacists have the opportunities of coöperative service, and adequate educational training is a contributing factor. The higher educational qualifications are not altogether based on whether the graduates will make practical application of what they have learned in college—that depends on the individuals and environments—but the students are thereby supplied with the "foundation for the business of living;" "the usefulness and service of pharmacy and the drug business are exemplified by the number of its cultured votaries, in its men of education, enlightenment and character."

E. G. E.

DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS REGARDING EDUCATION.

IT is not generally conceded that preliminary drug store training has value for the one who seeks to study pharmacy, or pass the examination of boards of pharmacy; at least, not of sufficient value to warrant the requirement of from two to four years of such application. Prof. H. M. Faser discussed the question in a paper before the Mississippi Pharmaceutical Association citing that the training of a young man or woman in a modern drug store is not the same as that in the shop of twenty-five years ago. The question comes up each year, in one way or another, as to whether all drug store experience should be had after graduation from a college of pharmacy, or be an entrance prerequisite. There will always be differences in the viewpoints of educators, just as there are of those who have applied themselves to the study of pharmacy, of those seeking such education and training; and some ask "why be educated?" The *New York World*, in a recent editorial, commented on the vagaries of education and pointed out that "the fallacy of vocational education as an ideal is demonstrated by the choice of subjects made by the working girls who are getting their first taste of college life at Bryn Mawr. They are girls from every industry—garment makers, telephone operators, tobacco workers, wrappers, labelers, machine packers, coil winders, bakers. They might have been expected to pick out courses that would throw light on their chosen work. In reality they prefer such studies as economics, literature, public speaking, history, physiology and music. What education they can get is a preparation for life, not for making a living."

"On the other hand," the editorial continues, "Princeton University announces the establishment of courses in all the engineering branches. Princeton is supposed to cater to the well-to-do, who need not concern themselves too much with the usefulness of knowledge before the professional school is reached. Can it be that vocational work takes hold on the imaginations of the cultured just as those who must work for their daily bread are beginning to see through it? Or is this contrast merely the natural result of the desire for what one does not have? Garment workers are naturally fed up with work; they have had plenty of it; Princeton boys—or some of them—may look upon work as a privilege, or at least a variation from more artificial activities."

During the first week in July, the American Classical League, an association of educators who uphold the cause of cultural education, convened in Philadelphia. Leaders in public life have questioned the value of classical education because of

the narrowness of the former academic curriculum, and business men often measure values only in terms of dollars and cents. There is coming a realization that there are extremists on both sides of the question of education: that the vocational courses without some study of the classics do not properly educate the youthful citizens.

Pharmaceutical educators also have different viewpoints; studies of mathematics, history, Latin, etc., some contend, might be extended with additional years of pharmacy courses. By no means should the time in college be a measure of what the actual or direct needs or application of the pharmacist are in the pursuit of his vocation—education should mean much more than this.

Some medical colleges, with advanced requirements for medical education, provided only for the subjects of the first two years; but this, if we are rightly informed, has not proved successful. In colleges of pharmacy a similar plan might result otherwise if the first two years qualify the druggist and the subjects of study are so arranged that further application by the students leads to other degrees.

E. G. E.

LAW MAKING, RATIONAL, AND IRRATIONAL.*

BY JAMES HARTLEY BEAL.

The faith of the average American citizen in the all-sufficiency of legislation to cure social, economic and moral evils is childlike and bland—a faith that is never chilled by the fact that rarely in his experience has he known a law to accomplish more than a fraction of the good that was predicted of it, and that many laws have either failed altogether or have introduced greater or more numerous evils than those they were intended to cure.

The framers of the American system of government proceeded upon the theory that the people who were least governed—who had the fewest laws to obey—were the best governed. To-day this ancient and once honorable doctrine is very much in the discard. No matter what evil is under consideration the first remedy thought of or proposed is legislation. The number of measures introduced during the life of a single Congress may run to ten or fifteen thousand, and even a state general assembly may be called upon to consider several thousand proposed new laws during a single session.

Granting that our highly organized civilization, with predominating industrial and economical interests, may require a more complex system of jurisprudence than would serve the necessities of a less specialized social organization, it is entirely absurd to assume that society needs the amount of regulation that these frantic attempts at law-making would indicate. Comparatively few of the proposed new laws possess any real merit. A large proportion simply reflect the spirit of meddlesomeness that governs the minds of those who gratuitously assume both their right and their ability to prescribe the standards according to which the remainder of their fellow citizens shall order their morals, their occupations and their daily lives.

*Delivered before the Urbana Association of Commerce.