

# THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

(We may not all agree with Dean R. A. Lyman's views on "The Three Year Course in Pharmacy," but we must admit that he is hitting at the weak spot in pharmaceutical education. Vocational training is bound to narrow our views of the general field of any subject, and it is to be hoped that our Three Year Courses will be less vocational and thus enlarge our field of vision.—C. B. Jordan, EDITOR.)

## THE THREE-YEAR COURSE IN PHARMACY.

BY RUFUS A. LYMAN.

During the spring months, there have come to my desk a number of special announcements setting forth the program of the minimum three-year course as planned in various Conference schools. When an institution takes the trouble to get out a special bulletin descriptive of a new program one rather expects to find something unusual, which would call forth such an effort. With this in mind, a study of these announcements is disappointing. In some cases the new three-year course is the old two-year course sprawled out. Occasionally a new course seems to be added to the curriculum. A closer analysis is apt to reveal the fact that the new courses are the old ones subdivided. When new ones have actually been added they smack of the trend of the times—a trend which the pharmacist alone is not guilty of following, namely—the filling of the curriculum with courses which seem "practical." A "practical" course may be defined as one which represents the application of learning but which does not constitute learning itself. On the other hand the study of some of the catalogs of recent date are more refreshing. In the development of the three-year course some men have sensed the weak points in the present day pharmaceutical training, namely, its extreme materialism, its so-called "practical" nature; its ever-narrowing tendency; its emphasis on non-essentials; its emphasis upon a training which is intended to satisfy only the needs of to-day; its failure to train so as to meet the needs of to-morrow; in a word—its lack of vision.

In the May number of the *Atlantic Monthly* is an article by John Hayes Taylor, which is deserving of the attention of every individual who sets himself up as a teacher. In the following sentences he shows the weak points in our educational efforts.

"How far the schools of the country are contributing to the apparently growing materialism and to the certainly growing crudity of life it must be difficult to say. Perhaps they are only exponential of it, a result more than a cause. In that case we are only going in a circle, undoubtedly vicious. Certainly the schools are catering to this instead of opposing it. The great accusation against them is that they are so largely substituting a lower motive in education for a higher one. One hears 'practical' spoken much oftener—certainly much louder—than one ever hears 'scholarship' or 'truth' or 'wisdom'. As for 'culture' one grows shy and hesitant over saying it at all. Steadily and firmly other motives are taken away from the student until often nothing higher is left to him than the necessity of making a living. Apparently he is to live only to come out even with himself at the end. 'The teacher and mother should confer together (sic),' I heard a lecturer on vocational guidance say, speaking of the child in the fifth