

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Honorable Newton D. Baker, ex-Secretary of War, was invited to address the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties at the Cleveland meeting. He gave one of the most inspiring addresses ever delivered before that body and the appeal which he makes for pharmacists to recognize the dignity of their relation to all education is most timely.

The National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was given a special invitation by the Conference to listen to Mr. Baker's address. This they did in a body and the prolonged applause which Mr. Baker received at the close of his address was only a small indication of the appreciation by his hearers of the wisdom of what he said.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee wishes to announce that the School of Pharmacy of the Agricultural College of North Dakota has been elected to Conference membership. The recent vote taken by mail at the order of the Conference was unanimous.

RUFUS A. LYMAN, *Chairman, Executive Committee and Conference Editor.*]

ADDRESS BEFORE THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES AT THE 23RD ANNUAL MEETING IN CLEVELAND BY HONORABLE NEWTON D. BAKER, EX-SECRETARY OF WAR.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I assure you that I recognize myself with great difficulty when introduced as a prominent educator. I have attempted to educate but one man, and sometimes, when in recent years my duties have been so distracting, I have of necessity abandoned the course of reading in which I delighted in my youth. I have felt that my education is in a backward direction, and if I continue as I have been going for the last ten years, I will be illiterate. Yet I can say, by way of amplification, that in my experience I have had some educational contacts of an extremely interesting kind.

The one that delights me most is the greatest educational fact that ever took place in the history of mankind. When the war was over and we had something like two million men in France, it was perfectly clear that a long time would necessarily elapse before those two million soldiers could be returned to the United States. They had been taken over with the aid of the British passenger ships at a rate which, in July of 1918, reached three hundred and thirty-four thousand in a single month. But as soon as the war was over, the British needed their ships to carry their Canadian soldiers home, and their men to outlying possessions, and as many of the British were of necessity withdrawn it looked as though it would take a year to get our army home.

The question arose as to what we should do with two million men in a foreign country, with nothing to do. An army is all right while it is being formed and trained, because it has rigid and exacting duties ahead of it, and every man's attention can be centered upon the perilous things he is to encounter and the tasks he is to perform, and he realizes the necessity of preparation that he may do these things as safely as possible. But when the war is over, an army of almost any size is a danger, not only to itself, but to the country in which it happens to be, because of all the trades and occupations, that of a soldier is least compatible with idleness.

My military associates on the other side conceived the notion that the only way to keep that army from running amuck or losing its mind was to drill it all the time. They woke those boys up at five in the morning and drilled them until they fell from exhaustion. Then they would let them sleep a little while and then drill them again, and they kept that up until there was almost a riot. I think there would have been a mutiny if they had been long subjected to that process.

We were hunting for something for them to do. The suggestion was made that they might turn their home talents into the reconstruction of devastated France, but they were in no mood to build roads or houses. Their idea was that others had been responsible for the destruction. We put our ear to the ground to see what the boys themselves thought they would like to do, and I think it is a tribute to American institutions to say that the answer which came, came from the boys themselves. It was not imposed by us older people upon them, but it came from the soldiers. They said, "We want education. We have been over here a year now, and we are likely to be here a year longer. Two years have been taken out of our training for life and we want education."

We instantly set about devising an educational system for those two million men. I shall not undertake to give you the details of that operation. It was, of course, the greatest educational opportunity ever undertaken in the history of the world—suddenly, out of nothing, to provide educational facilities for two million men in a foreign country. It had to be an education that was worth something, in view of the fact that it was for mature men—men in all degrees and grades of intellectual advancement. Some of the men were unable to read and some of them had been interrupted in their courses in college, where they were pursuing highly specialized courses.

The British and French opened all their universities to our students and we filled them with about twenty thousand students without making an appreciable dent in our problem. We even sent them to Ireland, to the University of Dublin. Every university and college in France—even those that had been closed—were opened. All the universities and minor colleges of England were filled to overflowing and still we had taken only twenty thousand out of our two million. Then we set up in every division, and practically in every regiment, schools which were taught by the men themselves. They, of course, taught reading and writing to the illiterate. They taught more advanced things as far as they could, but we realized that this was not responding fully to the need.

We took a great hospital which had been built in anticipation of a great battle which we were to fight, but never fought. We had estimated that our injured and wounded in that great battle would require accommodations for something like fifteen thousand wounded men, and we had the hospital all ready for those men when they should be wounded, but when the armistice was signed, there stood the hospital. In six weeks we had a university for twelve thousand students—not an elementary or primary school, but a university.

Mathematics, chemistry, zoölogy, all the languages, biology, history, art, painting, sculpture, music, theology, law, medicine and practically every faculty that is now in the curriculum of modern universities were represented there, and we had something over twelve thousand men taking university courses of such a grade that when they came back to this country the work would fit in with the course in any university as so much time gained. The amazing part of it is that practically all the teaching in that university was done by the soldiers themselves. We often talk about militarism as though it established a caste. It does. When an army is in the field there must be subordination. There come moments when someone in command must say to those over whom he is placed, "Go and do," and there is no time for debate and no time for question or explanation. If there is to be safety at all, it must lie in instant and unquestioning obedience. No other rule is possible, and yet, when we set up this university, I had the pleasure of going through it, and in one room, as a sample, I saw an instructor with a class of twelve, teaching integral calculus. Among the students there was one major, several captains and I think all the rest were lieutenants except the instructor. He was a private.

So constituted are Americans, that a man steps from the most subordinate position to a position of command, when the order of the day is changed, and in that university we had a complete reversal of the hierarchy of command, because, on the field, the major was the highest man and the private was the lowest, but when they got into the realm of intellectual attainments, the private was in command because of his superior knowledge. Even then we found we had not really solved the problem.

We found there were men scattered all over Europe in the Army of Occupation who were too far advanced for the schools possible to be set up there, and who could not be spared to come down to the university. They were not getting what they needed in an intellectual way, so a correspondence school was set up and notices were sent to every military camp in Europe that if there was any soldier there who could not get what he wanted, and could not be spared to come to the university, if he would write to the university, it would undertake to teach him by correspondence anything he wanted to know. There was no limit to the invitation.

So the system of correspondence instruction was started with forty thousand men, and by correspondence we taught Hebrew, Greek, Latin. My impression is that we even taught German to students who had just finished a great war against the German people, and who might be thought to have some prejudice against them.

Mr. President, while I can hardly claim to be an educator at all, I do claim contact with this great educational experience, and I am taking your time to tell you that, although it seems very remote. In the first place, I think it is a great fact, a fact which every American ought to

know, that when our army was over there and we were largely in despair about what to do with them—how to entertain them, and how to occupy them—our own men solved that problem. The wisdom came from the bottom up, and not from the top down. They said, "We want education."

The second reason I tell you is because it developed a new theory and a new system of education. It was the first time, so far as any knowledge goes, in which an educational system had ever been built for adults. All other educational systems are based on the theory that children begin with the A B C's but apart from the schools which we set up in this country for teaching English and Americanization to foreign people, who usually are literate in their own tongue, I know of no other educational system which has been suddenly built for the application of grades to adult persons.

Now this brought about a new technique. We found we could not get adult persons to use the spelling books and the reading books and the arithmetic books which we use for children of six, seven and eight years of age. The whole scheme was too immature and the rate of progress was far too slow for these men, whose minds were not trained, but were simply retarded by their failure of access to opportunities, and so we had to write an entirely new system of textbooks, and to adopt a new theory of pedagogy.

The most interesting of all those experiments grew out of the suggestion of a man who said, "These men have taught us they want education; now let's let them teach us what kind of education they want." He got a group of ill-assorted men and took them into a room and said, "Now, fellows, I have been sent here to teach you political economy. I don't suppose there is one here that knows what it is, but as I am going to teach it to you—it is the science of government. After a while we will get some of its special applications, but now I want you to work out a system by which you can learn the science of government, and I am going to follow your lead. I am supposed to have more knowledge, but you are supposed to have more curiosity. My theory of education is that it is most successful when the application of knowledge is to satisfy curiosity." I think that is a very great definition.

So he said, "What do you want to know?" Nobody wanted to know anything particularly. They were more or less indifferent, but he teased them to answer a series of questions. He picked out a boy and said, "What did you notice as you came over here this morning?" He thought he would be rather funny and said he noticed that the fellows hadn't policed their kitchen very well. "Fine," said the instructor, "that is a splendid start. Whose job is it to do that?" They debated that and decided it was the job of the kitchen police. The instructor then asked, "How do men get to be kitchen police, and what happens if they do not police their kitchen?" They went through the whole scheme. They described how, if the work was not properly done, the doctor had to come around and then special officers were put in charge and exercised their authority and, beginning with that mustard seed of inquiry, he built up the great structure of government, beginning where this small and unpleasant sanitary duty was imposed on man by way of punishment, and yet representing one of the great functions of organized society, and following it through to the whole scheme of governmental organization.

Now that suggestion was so revealing that when we came back to this country—got the army back and resorted to the peace-time army—we undertook to set up, in the army schools, the theory that men who enlisted in peace time ought to be so educated that after one or two terms of enlistment they could go into civil life and not bat around as the ancient soldiers used to do. The whole army educational system is based on that system, or theory, and if you are interested in its technique you will be instructed by a visit to some army school or some library where the books that were devised for that purpose are collected and see how, out of that single man's inspiration in France, grew this remarkable development. I would not recommend it for general application, but for adult persons.

Having justified my illustration, I want to make one or two observations. There used to be a time in human affairs when it was possible for a man to know everything. There are some half-dozen names in the history of learning of men who boldly said they knew everything there was to know, and probably said it truthfully, or nearly so. The admirable Crichton was regarded as admirable because, although a youth, he ventured to post a notice on every university that if anyone wanted to debate any subject, he was ready.

Pico Giovanni, Count of Mirandela, at the age of nineteen, went from one end of the country to the other, inquiring if there were any universities around, and as soon as anyone showed

him one, he would go up and nail on the door forty-nine propositions, any one of which he was ready to debate, and these forty-nine propositions practically covered the realm of knowledge.

Leibnitz, I suppose, really knew everything, or more than any other man that ever lived, though he himself made no boast about it—he was a modest man. It was thought that Leibnitz knew all there was to know on practically every subject. Undoubtedly, Bacon knew pretty much everything. Going farther back, Aristotle knew everything in his time, but that day is now dead. It is not possible for anyone to know everything. If you took a representative body of all the greatest scientists and had five hundred men, each of whom was the most accomplished on his subject, and took them into a room, someone on the outside would invent something that they had not heard of before they went into the room.

The development of knowledge, like everything else in this world, as far as a time basis is concerned, is practically instantaneous. We have annihilated time and space. I am not talking about Professor Einstein when I say this, but we have practically annihilated space and time. If it were of the slightest importance to the President of North China Republic to know what I am saying at this moment, it would cause him no inconvenience to discover it. He would simply connect up the necessary device to hear it by radio. Within the memory of the members of this company it would have taken some months to get the information over to the President of China; we have so brought up the general level of human intelligence that all over the world there are popping up investigators, research specialists and scientifically gifted persons who are adding to the sum of knowledge at a prodigious rate. Whether we like or do not like modern education, matters little.

We can only pick out a certain limited number of fields in which we can have a fairly thoroughgoing education. Now that brings up this problem: Young men and young women come to you to be educated in a specialty. Obviously, so far as that specialty is concerned, it is of the highest importance that that educational subject should be soundly given. But if you educated them into perfect pharmacists and left off there, so that they had no contact outside of the narrow circle of the science in which you instruct them, they would not yet be equipped for life, and so the duty upon you as educators is to find out where the most fruitful contacts are between a well-given pharmaceutical education and the rest of the education which is necessary for a rounded and useful and, therefore, happy life, like on the part of those who are the graduates of your institutions.

After all, the hardest problem that a man has when he leaves college is to fit his diploma to life—it doesn't fit automatically. He gets out and life is rectangular and his diploma is round, or his diploma is rectangular and life is round. The process of fitting that diploma to life is probably the most critical and discouraging experience the young have. You can make it easier to fit the diploma if, instead of having your pharmaceutical education a round education, you have it with antennae (so to speak)—arms that reach out and touch with sympathy the related branches of learning, and that is especially interesting to pharmacists because, after all, pharmacy is a kind of half-way house between research of pure chemistry and the application of chemistry by the medical profession.

You are just in the middle—the research man discovers and the engineer carries it into practice, but the pharmacist is mid-way between those two, and if your students could have a real, live sympathy with the scientific problems of pharmaceutical chemistry and some sort of sympathetic understanding of the problems which the internal medicine doctor has to deal with—if he could see his own problems in those two points of view he would be a more useful pharmacist.

In addition to that, the pharmacist has to be a citizen. Lawyers and doctors have to be citizens and you can't be a good citizen by being merely a good lawyer or merely a good pharmacist. Sometimes I think the pharmacist has a special obligation as a citizen. He usually has his store on the corner and it is a place where the neighborhood gathers. If he is a man of firmness of character and knowledge he gets to be a man of influence quite without knowing it, because he is in the center of a village community. This is of the highest importance that, among the subjects with which you seek to inspire your students, shall be those great public subjects—political questions, if you please—in which the common good is to be worked out by coöperation of citizens.

Of course, I may add to that one other thing. There is probably no other profession in which the ethical content is so necessarily high as it is in the pharmacist's profession. For a

variety of reasons, which you will understand without my enumerating them, the druggist has control of a great set of agents which the weak and frail members of society seek to acquire for misuse, and unless the pharmacist is a man who has a very high moral purpose, unless he can see straight and think clear, he is likely to be a danger to himself and his community.

I have said all that I came here to say. What I came here to plead for was that the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties should recognize the dignity of their relation to all education, for in this selective age, when it is no longer possible to know everything, the force of circumstances requires that a certain number of young men and young women shall bring their natural endowments to you to be trained. If you give them merely a limited perspective and unsympathetic education and unenlightened skill, then you have not done your whole duty by that priceless thing which those young people have brought to you to be trained, but if you give them contact with liberal and enlightening things and if you give them sympathies of a broad and general character, if you infect them with the consciousness of the fact that they are citizens and have great duties in that regard, and if you underlay all of those faculties with a broad ethical and moral basis, showing that character, after all, is the rock upon which both success and usefulness must be established, then pharmaceutical education will assume and maintain the same dignity in the great collection of educational faculties which are sought for and attained by other sciences.

NATIONAL WHOLESALE DRUGGISTS' ASSOCIATION.

In accordance with action taken at the forty-eighth annual meeting of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, this organization will undertake a standardization of expense accounting in coöperation with the Harvard University Bureau of Business Research.

A definite plan of coöperation with the federal authorities in relation to prohibition enforcement problems with particular respect to the trade features of that law was outlined in a series of resolutions adopted in connection with the recommendations of President F. C. Groover. The association recommends the immediate segregation of the supervision of alcohol for medical purposes from the unit having charge of prosecuting violations of the law against beverage uses of liquors. It was suggested that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue appoint a deputy commissioner to perform these functions for the bureau.

Other resolutions follow:

That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be requested to appoint an advisory trade committee from the membership of National Associations in trades employing alcohol to include the Washington representatives of such associations for purposes of consultation respecting the advisability and necessity of proposed regulations of importance to the alcohol using trades.

That The National Wholesale Druggists' Association earnestly protests against the enactment of the so-called Ernst-Wood bill removing the Prohibition Commissioner from the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

That The National Wholesale Druggists' Association earnestly urges the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to amend the existing office rules of the permit division in the following particulars:

"(a) By raising the \$25,000 stock requirement of a wholesale druggist who was not in business before the National Prohibition Act went into effect to \$100,000.

"(b) By refusing to renew permits to any applicant for a wholesale druggist's permit who employs a systematic policy of selling standard merchandise at approximate cost, as shown by advertisements, circulars, etc., thus using the wholesale drug business as a cloak to sell liquor."

In adopting the report of the Committee on Legislation the wholesale drug trade, as represented by the association membership, endorsed the suggestion that the enforcement of the Federal narcotic law be transferred from the prohibition unit to the miscellaneous division of the Internal Revenue Bureau and that the smuggling features of the law be handled by the customs division of the Treasury Department as was the case formerly.

The following were elected officers for the ensuing year: *President*, F. E. Bogart, Detroit; *Vice-Presidents*, R. H. Davis, Denver; A. B. Stewart, Seattle; W. N. Churchill, Burlington; H. D. Cowan, Buffalo; F. H. DeMoss, Louisville. New members of the Board of Control are B. B. Gilmer, Houston; A. H. Van Gorder, Cleveland; C. M. Kline, Philadelphia. C. F. Michaels, San Francisco, was made chairman of the Board of Control.

Cleveland was selected as the next meeting place.