

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Every teacher of Pharmacy is looking forward with interest to the adoption of a three-year minimum college course. We all recognize that the pharmaceutical syllabus contains much more than can be taught in the time allotted to the subjects in the two-year course. We have known for years that the two-year course is too crowded to give our students thorough training. The following paper by Professor Gidley expresses his joy in the prospect of release from this crowded condition and also convinces any doubter of the importance of the three-year minimum course.

C. B. JORDAN, *Chairman and Editor.*)

DE-LIGHT-ED!

BY W. F. GIDLEY.*

You will have to give that word a real Rooseveltian push to express what is in my mind as I think of the doing away of the hotchpotch two-year course in pharmacy. We'll say it served in its day. So did a two- or three-year course in medicine. The "short course" pharmacist served the "short course" physician. The demands of medicine have increased with lengthened fundamental and specific training. An augmented pharmaceutic professionalism is paged.

Until within the last few years nearly all business was local or, at most, sectional in character. Competition was rudimentary, as compared with its present state. Almost any shrewd and energetic man could make his mark in practical affairs without knowing very much about business in general.

To-day business is vastly more complex and fortuitous. Extraordinary developments in manufacturing, transportation, and credit have taken place. In order to be sure of making a place in the world a man must know business fundamentals and keep himself constantly informed. Commercial acumen has been set at a premium.

These professional and commercial whips cause us to exert a good deal of effort, but there are unusual compensations in the circumstance. The very fact of there being difficulties puts a bonus on the knowledge that will vanquish them. What are handicaps to the uninformed and untrained become shining opportunities for those who are prepared. The "two-year man" may be conscious of the opportunity that surrounds him, but you may be sure it is nothing in comparison to what will appear if he takes on added perspective. He lacks the full vision of the world of opportunity which more complete knowledge and better training might bring to him.

The present complexity of the profession of pharmacy is such that more complete knowledge and better training cannot be given in a two-year course. We had such a course before it became imperative that the druggist know a good deal about the science of bacteriology; before the pure food and drug laws made it obligatory on his part to make certain of the strength and purity of his drugs and chemicals; before the industrious chemotherapist flooded medicine with his new synthetics—many of which have the greatest importance; before scientific advertising brought the public to the drug store with the most diversified requests; before it became essential to the druggist's economic existence to read the signs of the times, to foresee tendencies, to be commercially enlightened.

* Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

I pointed out in my address as Chairman of the Section on Education and Legislation of the A. Ph. A. this year, the fact that the two-year course in schools of pharmacy is undergoing such kaleidoscopic alterations indicates that we recognize it as inadequate. We complete two years' work with a group of men and realize that in some particular they are not ready for the game of life. We try to correct the evil by cutting here and tacking on there—only to find that the next batch has a bald spot somewhere else.

Who of us cannot pick out schools of pharmacy that are over-topped on some pharmaceutical line? An especially capable botanist builds up his department until it overshadows all else in importance at his school. An unusual chemist, an enthusiastic economist, a skilful pharmacist, may comport himself in like manner. It simply shows that two years of time would be little enough for any one of those lines when nourishment is served by a master.

Perhaps it has been fortunate for the "two-year" student that many of us have been so loaded down with divers subjects to teach that we could not develop astonishing forebrain in any one of them. Indeed many of us have taught the whole gamut of the pharmaceutic curriculum. Efficiency is incompatible with such scatter-brain assignments.

Bring on the three-year course, in pharmacy—at least the three-year course. Let me have time to teach my subjects as the age requires them. I crave, for my students, that knowledge, training, vision, and enjoyment of their chosen life-work that only a systematic, intelligent, and properly timed course of study can bring them.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH.
RESEARCH INFORMATION, FEBRUARY 1924.

BY H. V. ARNY, CHAIRMAN.

The National Conference on Pharmaceutical Research is now fully organized with 10 main committees designed to transact its most important business. The members of the several committees are representatives of the following national organizations: American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, American Drug Manufacturers' Association, American Pharmaceutical Association, American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, Bureau of Chemistry, U. S. Department of Agriculture, National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, National Association of Retail Druggists, the Proprietary Association and the U. S. P. Revision Committee. Other national associations have been invited to join and when they enter the Research Conference their representatives will be assigned positions upon appropriate committees. As to the personnel of the ten committees, we find in the list given below, professors of pharmacy, pharmaceutical chemistry and pharmaceutical botany, retail pharmacists, chemists and botanists in pharmaceutical manufacturing plants and governmental scientists; geographically the committees include scientists from Massachusetts to Oregon and from Minnesota to North Carolina.

The ten committees follow:

Dispensing Pharmacy: G. M. Beringer, Chairman; J. A. Koch and E. R. Selzer.

Manufacture of U. S. P. and N. F. Galenicals: E. F. Cook, Chairman; W. L. Scoville and William Kaminski.

Standardization of U. S. P. and N. F. Galenicals: W. L. Scoville, Chairman; Louis Emanuel, G. A. Kinsel, C. H. LaWall, J. P. Snyder and W. H. Zeigler.

Manufacture of Medicinal Chemicals: H. A. B. Dunning, Chairman; C. J. Ballet and E. B. Carter.

Standardization of Medicinal Chemicals: C. H. LaWall, Chairman; E. B. Carter, W. O. Emery, B. L. Murray and Joseph Rosin.