

forty-one; the National of New York had twenty-seven and throughout the country there were 300 chains of drug stores, averaging six stores to the chain—and doing ten percent of the drug business of the United States.

Big money is behind this movement. When the Sherman and other anti-trust laws made it difficult for big financial interests to further exploit the industries a few years ago, they turned promptly to the retail field and so we have Standard Oil money in the Childs restaurants and in the Woolworth stores, while it is understood that Percy Rockefeller and E. H. Harriman money is back of the National Drug Stores and of the recently organized Mutual chain in Connecticut. It seems a little hard when we realize that the identical "Captain of Industry" who got our money yesterday when we bought gasoline at a filling station will get some more of it to-morrow, as a "Merchant Prince" when we go to the ten-cent store to buy something nice to take home to the wife.

Those of you who live in the large cities are familiar with that old story, "The Coming of the Chain." Some of you watched the United Cigar Stores Company come into New York City a number of years ago and promptly drive thousands of the old-time independent tobacco merchants out of business. Lately, and the process is still going on, you have watched the chain grocery stores invade the newly developing suburban sections of the city and strangle independent grocers so effectively that within a few months' time the field is in sole possession of the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company, Daniel Reeves, Butlers' and Grinstead Brothers. "God Save the King!"

I leave it to you to decide if conditions similar to that exist in retail pharmacy. Does the chain store operator rub elbows in friendly fashion with the independent dealer on the main streets of our larger cities or has he crowded him, with rare exceptions, into the suburbs, where he is following after him as rapidly as conditions permit? Has this unfriendly pushing led to an overcrowding of independent dealers in the less populous sections of our large cities and are these independent retailers hard put to make a decent living under the circumstances? Is there discontent among them and are they wondering which way to turn to make ends meet? Even a casual survey of conditions in retail pharmacy will give you the answer to these questions. The title of my paper does not permit me to take up those phases of the matter at this time.

COMMERCIAL PHARMACY OR BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION?*

BY ROBERT P. FISCHER.

Several years ago while conducting an investigation of the teaching of commercial training in pharmacy schools I was surprised at the number of letters received on the subject from pharmaceutical educators who did not believe in the teaching of what the "Pharmaceutical Syllabus" calls "commercial pharmacy." Discussion of the subject brought out that these professors did not fail to realize the make-up of the modern drug store, the need of training prospective pharmacists in accounting, advertising, selling and general merchandising and the advisability of giving such training in the enlarged pharmacy course. What then, was the objection to "Com-

* Read before Section on Commercial Interests, A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.

mercial Pharmacy" as a whole when its various subdivisions were approved of? Strange as it may seem it took some little time for the realization to sink in that it was not what we commonly understand as commercial pharmacy that was objected to but rather the designation "commercial pharmacy" applied to what is really merchandising or business administration.

All this fuss about a name! But after all there is justification for this point of view. The physician does not call his bookkeeping and collecting "commercial medicine." The lawyer does not designate his business administration "commercial law" and the chemist does not refer to the business phases of his work as "commercial chemistry." Advertising and selling are not peculiar to the practice of pharmacy, neither is bookkeeping. They come under the classification of business administration, or business science, if you please. While there may be modifications of general business methods for every profession or vocation, the fundamentals are the same. Let us therefore refer to the business or commercial phases of the drug industry as "Business Administration" or "Commercial Interests" and not as "Commercial Pharmacy." This will answer the two-fold purpose of being more accurately descriptive and avoiding any reflection on the professionalism of pharmacy as practiced in the prescription room or the laboratory.

When we now urge the colleges of pharmacy to turn out men fitted for the general work of the drug store as well as strictly pharmaceutical work we can resolve that a general course in business administration with special reference to the drug business be added to the present minimum pharmacy course. Most universities now have separate schools of business or colleges of commerce and it is not a difficult matter to add such training to the pharmacy curriculum.

A few years hence we will undoubtedly have a four-year pharmacy course in most institutions and these four years will be made up substantially of one year of general cultural training, the present two-year pharmacy course and a fourth year of business administration. This will give us a well-rounded course to fit all conditions in retail establishments and should be productive of a very high type of retail pharmacist.

A SIXTEENTH CENTURY CHAMPION OF PHARMACY.*

BY WILLIAM J. MCGILL.

Writers on things historical in pharmacy mention often Dumas, Scheele, Sertürner, and others acknowledged as leaders in pharmacy and chemistry, who began their careers as apothecaries. There is one neglected champion of pharmacy, not himself an apothecary, but in his own field as deserving of fame as these others, and who merits some recognition for his defense of a calling often maligned.

This was Bernard Palissy, the potter—an occupation sometimes considered a trade, but which in his conception of it, rose to the dignity of artistry. His life dated from 1509–1589, so that he had as contemporaries, Titian, Michel Angelo, Agnolo, Cellini, della Robbia, and in his own way can be considered an artist as much as any of these. His birthplace was in Perigord, France, and he was the son of a glass-worker, at that time accounted a noble trade. In his youth he traveled much, visiting all parts of his native country, becoming acquainted with

* Section on Historical A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.