

These are shown graphically on the accompanying outline map. The Committee on Time and Place of Meeting endeavors to follow a logical plan in the selection of sections of the country for the meetings, but the Committee does not designate particular cities in which the meetings should be held, in advance. After acceptable invitations are received, a recommendation of the place of meeting for the following year is made to the Association by the Committee.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

MARCH 1, 1923.

REORGANIZATION OR FEDERATION.

BY A. R. L. DOHME.

As president of the American Pharmaceutical Association at its annual meeting in August 1918 at Chicago I made a strong effort to bring about a federation of pharmaceutical activities in this country. The American Medical Association represents American medicine both potentially and actually because it has enrolled as members three-fourths of the physicians of the country. Whether this is a sign of strength or weakness in the form in which the A. M. A. is directed is an open question—but that it is a tower of strength when it comes to accomplishing results legislatively and protecting the interests of the individual physician legally is beyond dispute. This is not possible for pharmacy because it has at least seven national associations, most of which have a paid secretary and legal expert to protect its members' interests and unfortunately these paid people in order to make a proper showing individually and justify their pay and position usually prefer to shine individually than succeed collectively. Hence, in my opinion, reorganization alone will not produce coöperation and without coöperation there cannot be success. While reorganization is better than present organization, it can only very gradually accomplish what we are after primarily and that is united coöperation for a single end and purpose.

The National Association of Retail Druggists may wish the American Pharmaceutical Association well and trust it will succeed in its aims and purposes which are high and look to maintaining the science and the profession of pharmacy at its high level. The National Association of Retail Druggists regards pharmacy as a business and correctly so and feels that its mission is to increase the earning power of its members. A man in business is in business to make money and make as much of it as he can in the legitimate carrying on of that business and this prime feature of the pharmacist the A. Ph. A. has never recognized and in consequence it has never been a success as to membership and interests of the retail pharmacist. The meetings of the A. Ph. A. have from time immemorial been attended principally by the teachers of pharmacy and the allied interests catering to pharmacy and seeking to secure business from the pharmacist. The main work, interest and discussion at A. Ph. A. meetings are by the teaching and manufacturing interests. The main purpose in attending an A. Ph. A. meeting has always been meeting friends and hearing others read papers and convey knowledge. If you attend a N. A. R. D. meeting you will find principally retailers and observe that these retailers dominate the proceedings, do the work and accomplish the results which are almost entirely of a practical and financial nature.

You will find the same thing applies to local branch meetings as a rule as compared to local retailers' association meetings. Retail pharmacy to-day through the deplorable chain store development has become largely a merchandising business and the most successful retailers are usually the most successful merchandisers. But where the N. A. R. D. falls down is that it fails to recognize that the chief asset of the pharmacist is his professional standing and the feeling the general public and the physician hold regarding him. They prefer to buy allied lines from the pharmacist because of his scientific training which enables him to use better judgment in buying better goods and in knowing better how to keep them in proper shape. If this professional side is neglected largely or entirely at the expense of merchandising ability, the pharmacist loses his main asset and in consequence becomes a competitor with the confectioner and corner grocer or general store owner. Therefore it is essential that for maintaining his chief asset, that of being a scientific professional man with a college training and which places the physician so high in the minds of the public, the scientific and research side of his profession must be maintained. This the N. A. R. D. does not do but looks to the A. Ph. A. to do and the A. Ph. A. does do it. In other words the two associations dovetail wonderfully but being separate entities do not coöperate and hence fail to produce the needed result of stamping indelibly upon pharmacy the hallmark of a scientific profession that demands and should receive the respect of the public and its support. Most retailers attend the N. A. R. D. and not the A. Ph. A. and the chief asset of a pharmacist if he is to survive professionally is dispensed at the A. Ph. A. which retailers do not attend as a rule. Unless I am greatly mistaken, the yardstick to measure pharmacy and pharmacists will in future become in increasing degree his professional as against his merchandising standing and the store which depends upon its merchandising standing will lose out against the pure merchandiser without the scientific training.

Whether the reorganization plan proposed at the Cleveland meeting and which gives more power to the House of Delegates and thereby to the State Associations will produce the desired result is an open question; it will surely help and will doubtless increase the interest of the members. It will not, however, bring the rank and file of the retailers, especially the successful retailers, to the meetings. There is only one way to do this successfully and that is by federation by which I mean the formation of a United Drug Association like the United States of America as compared to the several states. *United we stand, divided we fall*, is an axiom in history. It applies as well to pharmacy as to our government. My effort at federation failed for two reasons—first, because it had not been sold to its several constituent parts in advance, and second, because the American Drug Manufacturers' Association, National Wholesale Druggists' Association, National Association of Retail Druggists and The Proprietary Association felt that it meant a possible domination of their interests by retailers because these so far outnumbered them severally and collectively. Other elements entered into the problem and were clearly observed by me at the time. The paid officials of these associations, where they had any, felt that their positions and their influence and hence value to their associations would be put in jeopardy by such federation. As they were in most cases the mouthpiece of their associations at meetings of their own and of other associations, their views carried. Trade jealousy also entered and it was con-

sidered bad business to let me get any credit for a progressive move. These objections, however, were not valid, for the underlying scheme was to have these associations retain their name, officers and unhampered control of their meetings and actions as theretofore except that in legislative matters there was to be a joint meeting (which would replace the present National Drug Trade Conference) of which all the several associations should be represented and united action sought. This would have a great advantage over the National Drug Trade Conference as definite action could be secured since all the associations would be in active session whereas the Conference can never take a definite action but must refer all action back to its constituent associations, which means that united action practically never occurs, only discussion. The manifest advantages would be that all branches of the trade would meet together and thus save the expense of attending several meetings; they would have a chance to meet all branches of the trade and when legislation was considered they would have the opportunity of coöperating and acting together on such matters as concerned all and needed united action.

As to the proposed plan of reorganization it marks a step in advance of existing conditions and as such is distinctly desirable and to be recommended. The hope and the expectation is that gradually through this plan the idea of federation will be more thoroughly discussed and better understood.

The real ultimate goal, however, should be to have a central home for pharmacy in a permanent building belonging to all branches of the profession and then to federate or consolidate all the separate associations under their own names as sections of a single centralized national association naturally called the American Pharmaceutical Association, both because of its name, its long and useful history, and its high standing and ideals, all assets that are valuable and not easily and successfully attained.



EX-PRESIDENT E. L. PATCH.
About the time when he presided at the former Asheville meeting of the A. Ph. A.



EX-PRESIDENT JOHN F. HANCOCK.
About the time when he presided as President of the A. Ph. A., 50 years ago.