

ARE PRIVATELY OWNED SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF PHARMACY  
OBJECTIONABLE AND NOT LIKELY TO PRODUCE THE  
BEST RESULTS?\*

BY EDWARD SPEASE.

The above question is one that has interested the writer not a little during the past few years. When the chairman, Mr. Freericks, of the Section on Education and Legislation asked me to submit a paper on one of twenty subjects, the above subject was chosen in order that the writer might ascertain what the opinions of others are upon it.

The question asked and which may be answered in this paper is not one of past tense but is clearly one of the present day. It is certain that the founders of pharmacy, medical and dental colleges in the past have not acted from selfish motives alone; surely some of these motives, or better the major portion of them, have been altruistic and for the advancement of the profession.

Is it not true that the major portion of institutions of learning at one time were privately owned? It certainly is true that such has been the case in regard to professional schools. Public institutions of learning have had to await overtures from the professions before they would include professional curricula, because the leaders in the professions have been interested financially in the privately owned schools. Medical and dental colleges have been entering the large universities quite rapidly in the past decade and so have quite a few pharmacy schools. Has this movement been a backward or a forward one?

One little thought occurs at this point. If graduating to-day, would you prefer a degree from Harvard or Yale to one from a college owned by John Jones? Suppose the said John Jones is recognized as the very topmost man in his profession—the success of his college and its reputation depends upon him and his name. When he dies, a leader of his ability may or may not appear. From which school, then, is the degree worth the more? Would you rather own stock in a small railroad paying high dividends to-day and owned solely by one man than stock in the Pennsylvania System? Which is the better permanent investment? The above questions of course are based upon the fact that the public does take cognizance of the school from which your degree is obtained.

Some of our university authorities have taken the stand that pharmacy is a trade and not a profession and that they do not wish to include with themselves trade schools. From the character of some drug stores to-day, they have abundant grounds for such views. Is not this state of affairs due largely to lack of proper education on the part of the pharmacist?

The physician has rapidly increased the standards of preliminary education and the pharmacist has not kept pace with him. Where is the pharmacy school that requires an A.B. degree for matriculation? How many require the minimum medical demands—two years of approved college work? We are not, however, overlooking this fact and we are tightening up as rapidly as we can, in fact, as rapidly as our large rank and file of non-college men will let us. So long as our schools

---

\* Read before joint session of Section on Education and Legislation, American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

accept less than high school graduates and our state boards accept the so-called self-made men without college training, just so long must we rank below the physician. This is not a reflection on the self-made man of twenty or forty years ago, times were different then, but it is a reflection upon the lack of education of the profession as a whole in that they have been unable to cope with the times.

How has the medical profession prevented the uprooting of their practice by medical cults, home-medication-patented-fakes, and what not? They have done so by legislation. They can not stem the tide of such growths but can inhibit their activity by legislation and prevent serious inroads upon the educated practitioner. Have we been sufficiently far sighted (educated) to secure proper legislation to prevent the many and various inroads upon our profession? This could have been done if our whole rank and file really stood for better things.

The remedy for this condition is to turn out educated men. Can the privately owned school furnish this education? No, it is impossible. Many university men will be even willing to admit that in strictly pharmaceutical subjects the privately owned schools have been par excellence and indeed in many instances have excelled the university schools. But how about the subjects such as English, Mathematics, Languages, Economics and the so-called cultural subjects? Are they to be utterly ignored if we build up pharmacy? Can these be given by privately owned schools? How about the associations between pharmacy students and students in other courses—are they beneficial or harmful? Indeed this last question might even be asked concerning instructors. Have not the medical and dental professions suffered from the same thing? Do the three professions as men alone rank on a par with other college graduates? In isolated cases, yes, but as professions—do they?

The finger of scorn should not be pointed at the grand old men of our profession nor should they be criticized for the past, as they lived under different conditions then. They will be criticized if they do not join the procession of progress to-day and help to better things for pharmacy.

One other thought remains. It is impossible to furnish complete education at the least possible cost to the most people through privately owned schools, and this is really the fundamental principle of education. Tuition alone will not maintain a school properly. If a profit is made from apparatus used, materials used and lectures given, then we are piling up cost upon the student.

The university is supported by taxation, state appropriation or by endowment. It can furnish in this way more things to the student than can a privately owned school. It certainly is eminently proper that the state pay for the education of its pharmacy men, who help conserve public health, as well as for the education of real estate men and those who enter the insurance business. In case a university receives its support from endowment, this endowment should be sufficiently large so that the student may receive his education at a cost that will be at least as low as that from a university supported by taxation.

All our professional schools should either be integral parts of universities or be so affiliated with them that the student may have the benefits from the university without more cost to him than to any other university student.

We should insist that our *Materia Medica* teachers should also teach the medical students and that our pharmacy teachers should have at least courses enough among

the medical students so as to inform them of the value of the Pharmacopoeia and the National Formulary. Our medical students should be taught prescription writing by pharmacy men so that they could learn while in school that it is not merely for the sake of getting business for the druggist. Our free dispensaries and clinics should be filled with ethical preparations made by our pharmacy schools and there let the embryo doctor see them and know they are made by pharmacy men. With a few years of this, could the cheap so-called pharmaceutical house sell "just-as-goods" and "twice-as-cheaps" to a trained physician? If the pharmacist and physician gain mutual confidence in each other by this plan of early coöperation, there would then be no room for the detail man who has been taking advantage of the lack of education of both parties.

This paper is intended to invite friendly criticism, not from those who wish to make money from education, but from those who can see that lack of education or education along narrow lines only, is the disease that is undermining ethical pharmacy of to-day.

DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACY,  
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

---

#### MAKING EDUCATION PRACTICAL.

Agitation is now going on in certain circles designed to make education more practical. This ought not to be difficult of accomplishment. It will strike the average person that the easiest way to bring it about will be to abolish many of the fads now occupying the education school board, and to revert to the fundamentals which occupied the attention of our fathers. It will also strike the average critic that lack of application is one of the gravest evils that afflict our educational system. The average parent and the average teacher have come to believe that a pupil can skim over this and skim over that and retain it. Nothing is farther from the truth. Success in education, like success in everything else, comes from hard work. When we get back to the idea that our pupils in school like their parents out of school must work for the success they attain, we are much more likely to achieve results than we are under our present scheme of doing things.—*Peoria (Ill.) Star.*

---

#### STUDENTS MAKE A UNIVERSITY.

We have heard a good deal in the last few days about the troubles with our educational institutions. Some think they are too rich, some think that they are ruled by ignoble interests, by men who are intellectually bound, and others say we should change our system for that of Germany. All this discussion seems rather puerile. There are only two things which make a college or university—teachers and students. Any school in the world can be of the best if the student wishes it. No equipment, however large, is of any value where the student is not minded to work hard. First and last, any student gets out of college life just as much as he puts into it. The trouble is that in these days too few young men are minded to put much into their college life.—*Philadelphia Inquirer.*