AWPM
B9
1967

SOME TRENDS IN EDITORIAL OPINION IN SELECTED PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNALS DURING THE PERIOD 1920 THROUGH 1964

by

ROBERT ARMIN BUERKI

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

(Pharmacy)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. Ernst W. Stieb for his direction and encouragement throughout the course of this investigation.

Research was supported in part by the Research Committee of the Graduate School from special funds voted by the State Legislature, which support is hereby acknowledged with appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Objectives	1
	Definitions	2
	Review of the literature	5
	Limitations	8
II	METHODOLOGY	11
	Choice of Journals	11
	Sampling Procedure	12
	Coding Procedure	14
III	DEVELOPMENT OF THE JOURNALS CONSIDERED	18
	Introduction	18
	American Journal of Pharmacy	19
	American Professional Pharmacist	24
	Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	28
	N.A.R.D. Journal	39
	American Druggist	45
	Drug Topics	54
IV	PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT CATEGORIES BY FIVE-YEAR PERIODS	64
	Combined categories of analysis	64
	Editorials dealing with legislation affecting pharmacy	66
	Editorials dealing with administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy	67
	Editorials dealing with the profession and practice of pharmacy	68
	Editorials dealing with pharmacy organizations	70
	Editorials dealing with government and pharmacy	71
	Editorials dealing with pharmaceutical literature	72

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont.

Chapter		Page
	Editorials dealing with research, discovery, and invention in pharmacy	73
	Editorials dealing with pharmaceutical education	74
	Editorials dealing with other subjects ...	75
V	PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT CATEGORIES BY JOURNAL	87
	Combined categories of analysis	87
	Editorials dealing with legislation affecting pharmacy	92
	Editorials dealing with administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy	96
	Editorials dealing with the profession and practice of pharmacy	97
	Editorials dealing with pharmacy organizations	101
	Editorials dealing with government and pharmacy	102
	Editorials dealing with pharmaceutical literature	104
	Editorials dealing with research, discovery, and invention in pharmacy	106
	Editorials dealing with pharmaceutical education	107
	Editorials dealing with other subjects	109
VI	EDITORIAL VIEWS ON PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION	125
	Standards of education in pharmacy	126
	Internship and practical experience in pharmacy	153
	Continuing education in pharmacy	158

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont.

Chapter		Page
VII	EDITORIAL VIEWS OF PHARMACEUTICAL ORGANIZATIONS	168
	American Pharmaceutical Association	169
	National Association of Retail Druggists	191
	Other national, state, and local associations	211
	The federation movement in pharmacy	224
VIII	EDITORIAL VIEWS ON PHARMACY'S RELATIONS TO THE PUBLIC	257
	Introduction	257
	The early 1920's	262
	The early 1930's	269
	The early 1940's	276
	The early 1950's	285
	The early 1960's	291
IX	SUMMARY REMARKS	297
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES CITED		308
APPENDIX A.	Content Analysis Coding System	
APPENDIX B.	Supplemental Tables	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Categories of Analysis by Period	76
II	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy by Period	77
III	Editorials Dealing with Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy by Period	78
IV	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy by Period	79
V	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations by Period	81
VI	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy by Period	82
VII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature by Period	83
VIII	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy by Period	84
IX	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education by Period	85
X	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects by Period	86
XI	Categories of Analysis by Journal	110
XII	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy by Journal	112
XIII	Editorials Dealing with Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy by Journal	114
XIV	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy by Journal	116
XV	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations by Journal	118
XVI	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy by Journal	119
XVII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature by Journal	121

LIST OF TABLES - Cont.

Table		Page
XVIII	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy by Journal	122
XIX	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education by Journal	123
XX	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects by Journal	124
XXI	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy in the American Journal of Pharmacy...	344
XXII	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy in the American Professional Pharmacist	345
XXIII	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	346
XXIV	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy in the N.A.R.D. Journal	347
XXV	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy in the American Druggist	348
XXVI	Editorials Dealing with Legislation Affecting Pharmacy in Drug Topics	349
XXVII	Editorials Dealing with the Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy in the American Journal of Pharmacy	350
XXVIII	Editorials Dealing with the Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy in the American Professional Pharmacist	351
XXIX	Editorials Dealing with the Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	352
XXX	Editorials Dealing with the Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy in the N.A.R.D. Journal	353
XXXI	Editorials Dealing with the Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy in the American Druggist	354

LIST OF TABLES - Cont.

Table		Page
XXXII.	Editorials Dealing with the Administrative and Economic Aspects of Pharmacy in Drug Topics	355
XXXIII	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy in the American Journal of Pharmacy	356
XXXIV	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy in the American Professional Pharmacist	357
XXXV	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	358
XXXVI	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy in the N.A.R.D. Journal	359
XXXVII	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy in the American Druggist	360
XXXVIII	Editorials Dealing with the Profession and Practice of Pharmacy in Drug Topics	361
XXXIX	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations in the American Journal of Pharmacy	362
XL	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations in the American Professional Pharmacist	362
XLI	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	363
XLII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations in the N.A.R.D. Journal	363
XLIII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations in the American Druggist	364
XLIV	Editorials Dealing with Pharmacy Organizations in Drug Topics	364

LIST OF TABLES - Cont.

Table		Page
XLV	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy in the American Journal of Pharmacy	365
XLVI	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy in the American Professional Pharmacist	366
XLVII	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	367
XLVIII	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy in the N.A.R.D. Journal	368
XLIX	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy in the American Druggist	369
L	Editorials Dealing with Government and Pharmacy in Drug Topics	370
LI	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature in the American Journal of Pharmacy	371
LII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature in the American Professional Pharmacist	372
LIII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	373
LIV	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature in the N.A.R.D. Journal	374
LV	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature in the American Druggist	375
LVI	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Literature in Drug Topics	376
LVII	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy in the American Journal of Pharmacy	377
LVIII	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy in the American Professional Pharmacist	377

LIST OF TABLES - Cont.

Table		Page
LIX	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	378
LX	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy in the N.A.R.D. Journal	378
LXI	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy in the American Druggist	379
LXII	Editorials Dealing with Research, Discovery, and Invention in Pharmacy in Drug Topics	379
LXIII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education in the American Journal of Pharmacy	380
LXIV	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education in the American Professional Pharmacist	380
LXV	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	381
LXVI	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education in the N.A.R.D. Journal	381
LXVII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education in the American Druggist	382
LXVIII	Editorials Dealing with Pharmaceutical Education in Drug Topics	382
LXIX	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects in the American Journal of Pharmacy	383
LXX	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects in the American Professional Pharmacist	383
LXXI	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	384

LIST OF TABLES - Cont.

Table		Page
LXXII	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects in the N.A.R.D. Journal	384
LXXIII	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects in the American Druggist	385
LXXIV	Editorials Dealing with "Other" Subjects in Drug Topics	385

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
I	Genealogy of the American Journal of Pharmacy	23
II	Genealogy of the American Professional Pharmacist	29
III	Genealogy of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	40
IV	Genealogy of the N.A.R.D. Journal	46
V	Genealogy of the American Druggist	55
VI	Genealogy of Drug Topics	62

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The sweeping socio-economic and technological developments affecting the profession of pharmacy which have gained momentum during the past four decades have brought with them correspondingly sweeping changes in the character and very delineation of the profession. While pharmacy has generally flourished under the stimulus of these developments, it has also acquired accompanying problems, such as court decisions that have held pharmacy to be a trade, not a profession, and a prescription to be a commodity, not a professional service.

Contemporary pharmaceutical journal of this era might provide a partial explanation to these dilemmas. The editorial content in particular might yield information useful in tracing the thinking of the editors of these publications--presumably among the opinion leaders in pharmacy--during these turbulent years. To determine the validity of this assumption, the present study was undertaken. Its objectives are threefold:

1) To develop a method of editorial analysis for professional journals;

2) to describe and analyze trends in editorial coverage in six pharmaceutical journals during the period 1920 through 1964; and

3) to compare and contrast editorial opinions on certain selected topics during this period.

Such an analysis of trends in editorial opinion requires a refinement of research technique beyond a mere literature search or a cursory inspection of material thought to be relevant to the topic. Such a refinement is the technique of content analysis, characterized by one writer as "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication."[1] Berelson deals at some length with four terms[2] in the above definition:

"Objective" means that the categories of analysis are defined so precisely that different analysts can apply them to the same content and get the same results. If content analysis were subjective instead of objective,

---

1. Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communications Research (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952), p.18.

2. Ibid., p. 17.

each man would have his own content analysis. The results should depend upon the system, not the analyst.

"Systematic" means that the categories are set up so that all relevant content is analyzed. This eliminates bias through selection of categories that lead to analysis of only a part of the relevant content. Secondly, the analyzes must be designed to secure data relevant to a scientific problem or hypothesis.

"Quantitative," of course, means the use of quantitative data. This usually implies numerical values, although not necessarily so. As Berelson points out, it is quantification that most distinguishes content analysis from reading.

"Manifest content" means the apparent content, that is, content must be coded as it appears rather than as the coder feels it is intended. There are two important reasons why only the manifest content should be considered: First, it is often nearly impossible to determine the intent in any objective fashion; secondly, unless only manifest content is considered, reliability would be low.

Berelson also points out three assumptions[3] implied in the definition:

---

3. Ibid., pp. 18, 19, and 20.

1. Content analysis assumes that inferences about the relationship between intent and content or between content and effect can validly be made, or the actual relationships established.

2. Content analysis assumes that study of the manifest content is meaningful. This assumption requires that the content be accepted as a "common meeting ground" for the communicator, the audience, and the analyst.

3. Content analysis assumes that the quantitative description of communication content is meaningful.

The first of these assumptions points out that content analysis is valuable only if it can tell us something besides the mere characteristics of content--the key must unlock a door. Content analysis has proved useful because inferences between content and intent and content and effect have been reasonable.

The second assumption establishes manifest content as a common unit for the communicator, the audience, and the analyst. The analyst assumes that the communicator and the audience are dealing with manifest content and that the intentions of the former and the understanding of the latter are based on the manifest content.

The third assumption is that frequency is an important attribute of communication. It is assumed that there is some important difference between a journal which consistently editorializes on merchandising and

one which is mainly concerned with professional ethics, for example.

Content analysis is a relatively new research tool. Malcolm M. Willey in The Country Newspaper credits J. G. Speed and Delos F. Wilcox with the pioneering work in content analysis.[4] Speed made the first recorded content analysis in 1893, but it was a highly subjective one.[5] Wilcox published the first study that was based upon an approximation to scientific methodology in 1900.[6] Probably the earliest content analysis of pharmaceutical journals was made by H. P. Hynson in 1904.[7] These studies were subject matter analyses.

It was the work of Harold D. Lasswell and his associates in the late 1930's and early 1940's, however, that established content analysis as a research tool. Lasswell's interest in content analysis apparently stemmed from a prior interest in political propaganda, for it was his contention that "the study of politics can be advanced by the quantitative analysis of political

---

4. Malcolm M. Willey, The Country Newspaper (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1926), p. 25.

5. J. G. Speed, "Do Newspapers Now Give the News?" The Forum, 15: 705-11, 1893.

6. Delos F. Wilcox, "The American Newspaper, A Study in Social Psychology," Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, 16: 56-92, 1900.

7. H. P. Hynson, "Pharmaceutical Journals," Pharmaceutical Review, 22: 353-55, September, 1904.

discourse."[8] Lasswell and his associates emphasized this point to the United States government sufficiently that content analysis became a part of the government intelligence operation during World War II. As a result of this work content analysis was accepted as court testimony in the sedition trials of William Dudley Pelley and others, an analyst being admitted as an expert witness. This acceptance of content analysis results lends impressive support to the potential objectivity and meaningfulness of the technique.

The growth of content analysis since World War II can be attributed to the group that worked with Lasswell. These men have been particularly important because of the lack of published material about symbol and theme analysis. Lasswell's The Language of Politics appeared in 1949 and was the first source of technical information about these two new methods aside from some information given in journal articles. Berelson's book, which describes the history and the scope of content analysis, was published in 1952.

In a trend analysis, differences in the categories into which content falls at various periods and differences in the category frequencies describe the trends in content for the period of study. Since our study is

---

8. Harold Lasswell, Nathan Leites, et al., The Language of Politics (New York: George W. Stewart, 1949), p. 40.

essentially a trend analysis, we may mention here some representative trend studies. Thus, for example, Kenneth Bartlett found that the percentage of popular music on radio rose from 61 per cent in 1933 to 75 per cent in 1939.[9] Ethel Shanas discovered that in recent years the American Journal of Sociology has increased its attention to problems of population, race and nationalities, and methods of research while decreasing the attention to theory and history of sociology and social reform.[10] Irene Taeuber found that the percentage of shop-set news from the locality and trade area for thirty Minnesota weekly newspapers rose from 28 per cent in 1860 to more than 80 per cent in 1890.[11] Sergius Yacobson and Lasswell determined that May Day slogans in the Soviet Union made increasingly more use of national symbols and less of universal revolutionary symbols as the years passed.[12] Hornell Hart showed the changing

---

9. Kenneth G. Bartlett, "Trends in Radio Programs," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 213: 15-25, 1941.

10. Ethel Shanas, "The American Journal of Sociology Through Fifty Years," American Journal of Sociology, 50: 522-33, 1945.

11. Irene B. Taeuber, "Changes in Content and Presentation in Minnesota Weekly Newspapers, 1860-1929," Journalism Quarterly, 9: 281-89, 1932.

12. Lasswell, op. cit., Chapter 10.

social attitudes of the American people as reflected in popular magazine articles from 1900 to 1930.[13]

Since content analysis essentially involves the classification of a selected sample of content into a systematic set of categories, several methodological problems present themselves. The selection of a sampling method is complicated by the wide variety of communication media that has been analyzed. The basic problem, finding that method that produces a sample varying least from the population, applies to all media. Sampling validity is not a major problem because there are many valid sampling methods applicable to content analysis.

Three methods of content analysis are most frequently used: symbol analysis, theme analysis, and subject analysis. The latter, which describes the nature of the subject matter, is appropriate to our study.

Subject matter categories are first set up to cover all the content to be studied. These categories can be set up intuitively or by analysis of similar content not in the particular sample. The former method can result in the omission of important categories which would in some instances force the analyst to start over; the latter method is ideal when possible, but there is not

---

13. Harnell Hart, "Changing Social Attitudes and Interests," in Recent Social Trends in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933), 1: 382-442.

always enough similar content to give the analyst any assurance he will come up with all the necessary categories. In practice, a combination of the two approaches worked best.

It is necessary, of course, to make sure that the categories cover all the relevant material, are objective, and are as mutually exclusive as possible. Many subject matter analyses include some measure of length; for this study the number of times a subject appeared in each of the sub-groups within the larger categories was used instead as a measure of volume due to the large size of the sample. After the categories are completed and pretested in a trial run on content similar to that in the sample--in this study a similar sample for the years 1925 through 1929--they are then applied to the sample and the frequencies recorded for the subjects encountered.

The rest of the procedure is one of analysis into which the usual considerations enter. In content analysis, as in other research methods, generalization beyond the limits of the sample, manipulation of statistics without due regard to assumptions, and other such sins of the analyst do not yield valid results. Content analysis is a tool like, let us say, a typewriter. Some people have typewriters that cannot spell; so it is with content analysis. The method cannot cover up mistakes in setting up objectives or in analysis; the researcher is still responsible.

Finally, it should be remembered that editorial content is produced by editors--and it is their conception of audience attitudes and values which determines what appears; that content is subject to pressure of special-interest groups which may determine or influence content; and that popular attitudes may determine content as well as the reverse--presumably, there is a mutual effect. It also should be emphasized that an important word in the title of this study is "Selected"; these limits are self-imposed, by choice--and the trends thus selected are put down in the hope that the intersection indicated by the many articles entitled "Pharmacy at the Crossroads," or the like, may soon be crossed.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The following six journals--or groups of journals--were chosen for editorial content analysis on the bases of presumed audience, presumed editorial position, importance, and availability:

1) American Journal of Pharmacy (1920-1964)

2) American Professional Pharmacist

   title varies: Practical Druggist and Spatula (1920-1935)

   American Professional Pharmacist (1935-1964)

3) Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association

   title varies: Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (1920-1939)

   Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition) (1940-1960)

   Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (New Series) (1960-1964)

4) N.A.R.D. Journal[1] (1920-1964)

5) American Druggist

   title varies: American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record (1920-1922)

   American Druggist (1922-1964)

---

1. Official journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists.

6) Drug Topics (1920-1964)(Absorbed Druggists' Circular in 1940)

The universe for this study consisted of all editorials[2] in the above journals for the period 1920 through 1964. Since the variance of the subject matter discussed in these editorials over a period of forty-five years was expected to be very high, it was decided that a random sample of fifty per cent of the editorials which appeared during this period would be the smallest possible representative sample that could be drawn; however, the resulting sample would have proved more sizeable than could be analyzed with reasonable thoroughness for a study of this scope and sophistication. Therefore, only the first five years in each of the five decades in the period under consideration were chosen for analysis, i.e., 1920-1924, 1930-1934, 1940-1944, 1950-1954, and 1960-1964.

A problem arose due to the variety of publication schedules encountered over the years for the six journals: weekly, fortnightly, semi-monthly, monthly, and bimonthly. Since

---

2. Defined as "a signed or unsigned newspaper or periodical article usually given a special or significant place in the publication that intentionally expresses the views of those in control of the publication on a matter (or matters) of current interest." (Adapted from a definition in Webster's Third New International Dictionary [Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1961], p. 723.) A journalistic definition of "editorial" may be found in Hillier Kriegbaum, Facts in Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), pp. 19-22. Also see Curtis MacDougall, The Press and Its Problems (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc., 1964), pp. 137-139.

"monthly" was a common denominator for all journals, it was decided to sample fifty per cent of the months for every year in the five five-year periods selected and to include all editorials which appeared during the months thus chosen. This method had the advantage of placing all journals on an equal footing, editorially speaking, since a weekly publication would not be under-sampled at the expense of a monthly publication.

The sample was drawn by rolling dice. Since there are only eleven possible combinations on a pair of dice, the sample could not be drawn directly. It was therefore decided to use two different colored dice and to let one die represent the first six months of the year and let the other die represent the last six months; thus, a year's sample could be drawn with a minimum of three rolls of the dice. In practice, of course, several rolls were necessary since a month could be chosen only once for each year within a five-year period, and rolling dice is a form of sampling with replacement. This convention also had the advantage of avoiding "bunching" of the sample by insuring that one-half of the months in the sample would be drawn from each half of every year in the five five-year periods selected. Since a separate sample was drawn for each of the six journals considered, a total of thirty different fifty per cent random samples resulted, each sample covering a five-year period.

A set of index cards was prepared to identify each month drawn in the sample. A sample number was assigned to each such month and placed in the upper right-hand corner of each card; the upper left-hand corner was reserved for the following coded information:

1) journal title
2) month of publication
3) year of publication
4) volume of journal
5) number of journal
6) name of editor[3]

The first three pieces of coded information were placed on the index cards at the outset to aid in compiling the editorial material in the sample. Auxiliary cards were prepared when a publication schedule other than monthly was encountered, and were designated by adding "A", "B", "C", "D", and "E" to the existing sample number. Thus, a weekly publication might receive the

---

3. Defined as "one who directs or supervises the expressive policies or the preparation of a publication, such as a newspaper or periodical, as indicated by the masthead of the publication." (Adapted from a definition in Webster's Third New International Dictionary [Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1961], p. 723.) The obligations and duties of an editor are set forth by Hillier Kriegbaum, Facts in Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), pp. 17-19.

following sample numbers for one sampled month: 1234-A, 1234-B, 1234-C, 1234-D, 1234-E.

For convenience, all editorials encountered while inspecting the journals within the drawn sample of months were Xeroxed, trimmed, and placed with their respective sample cards. This procedure introduced an element of flexibility into the processing of such a large bulk of often brittle material, saved many hours of note-taking, and is highly recommended for this type of research. At this point the next three pieces of coded information were recorded in the upper left-hand corner of the sample cards, and directly beneath, the title of the editorial--or the name of the column--and the pages on which it appeared. Finally, a one- or two-word description of the subject matter of the editorial was placed under the sample number; these descriptions served as the basis for subsequent subject classification and analysis. If several topics were covered in one editorial, duplicate sample cards were prepared, one for each topic encountered; if no editorial was found in the sampled number of the journal, "no editorial" was written on the sample card. Upon examination, nine categories of subjects were developed and coded (see Appendix A).

An example of the codes in use may serve to clarify the above discussion:

11-13-20-096-03-101-201	0005
"The Faults of Medical Education," education pp. 145-46.	

The codes for the most part are easily committed to memory and may be translated later directly into a bibliographic reference:

> Beringer, George M., "The Faults of Medical Education," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 145-46, March, 1920.

The sample number and abbreviated subject classification at the right serve as an additional means of identification, should the card be misplaced or taken out of sequence, and aids in filing.

The coded information serves not only as a form of bibliographic shorthand but could serve also as a basis for IBM analysis, for the information may be either punched directly into IBM cards by a key-punch operator or transferred to machine-scored answer sheets[4] and fed into an IBM #1230 machine, which automatically translates them into a set of IBM cards. The cards may then be used for analysis, table building, and statistical manipulations by utilizing a card sorter or a computer. IBM analysis was not deemed necessary for this particular study; however, the principle of pre-coding materials for content

---

4. In this case, IBM form #H91196.

analysis prior to or during initial inspection, rather than coding during the analysis step is a methodological technique worth serious consideration.

In all, a total of 1,415 editorials was analyzed, comprising a total of 3,024 separate topics. A series of tables compiling these topics by time period and a second series compiling the topics by journal are analyzed in Chapters IV and V, respectively. A third series of tables compiling the topics by period for each of the six journals considered appears as Appendix B, and forms the basis for any statements concerning apparent trends in editorial opinion. These tables will be discussed in detail in Chapter V.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF THE JOURNALS CONSIDERED

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to acquaint the reader with the six journals considered in this study and to trace the development of their editorial policies since their inceptions, the emphasis, of course, being placed on the period 1920 through 1964. To encapsulate the flavor and aura and, hopefully, the editorial Zeitgeist of six journals in a dozen or so pages presents a formidable challenge. The material, for the most part, was gleaned from the pages of the journals themselves--mastheads, announcements, anniversary numbers, and, of course, the editorials. A change in format, ownership, or editor usually signalled a statement, restatement, or justification of editorial policy, many of which are herein recorded. A genealogy of each journal was also prepared for quick reference.

Finally, the author echoes the implicit challenge which J. H. Salisbury expressed in the first volume of the Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

> The medical [or pharmaceutical] journal, like the newspaper, is an ever-present friend whose influence and advice are potent for good or evil. Whoever gains

> control of the medical press goes a long way toward securing a paramount influence on the entire . . . profession.[1]

American Journal of Pharmacy

Established in 1825 as the Journal of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, the American Journal of Pharmacy assumed its present name in 1835 as a reflection of its growing influence and importance, yet it has remained always under the ultimate control of the College. The Journal is significant in the history of journalism not only as the official organ of the first permanent local organization of American pharmacy, indeed of the English-speaking world, but also as the first permanent journal of pharmacy in the English language to appear anywhere. Published only irregularly during the first few years of its existence due to the paucity of original essays and researches, the Journal became a quarterly in 1829, its prospectus stating:

> The wants of society and the profession demand some medium by means of which knowledge, so valuable and interesting, may be more widely and speedily circulated, and made more generally accessible.
>
> The College of Pharmacy, therefore, in accordance with these views, proposes to publish a Quarterly Journal, which shall embrace, at once, as much original

---

1. J. H. Salisbury, "The Subordination of Medical Journals to Proprietary Interests," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 205, July, 1906, cited by Glenn Sonnedecker, "The Journal Is Born," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 777, December, 1961.

> matter as can be procured in the several branches of sciences connected with Phærmacy, and the most important discoveries and improvements made in the art by Europeans.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The subjects to be embraced in this journal will be those strictly connected with Pharmacy. Chemistry (General and Pharmaceutic), Materia Medica, Zoology, Botany, and Mineralogy, are the legitimate objects of the Pharmaceutist, and form the elements of his art.[2]

A number of distinguished American pharmacists such as Daniel B. Smith, Benjamin Ellis, Robert E. Griffith, and William Procter, Jr., lent their own flavor as editors during its long and proud history. During the early 1830's Griffith, by reason of his original papers on medicinal plants, made a reputation for the Journal "in a field for which it long held a noteworthy position."[3] During Procter's tenure the editorial department became an important feature of the publication. It was at this time that the American Pharmaceutical Association came into existence, and for many years the minutes of the proceedings and most of the papers presented at the annual meetings of the Association were published in the Journal, although no

---

2. Daniel B. Smith, et al., "Prospectus," Journal of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 1: 1-2, April, 1829.

3. Joseph W. England (ed.), First Century of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 1821-1921 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, 1922), p. 400.

official connection existed. Under John M. Maisch's hand, the Journal became a monthly. Yet during the forty-five-year period under consideration here two men dominate, Ivor Griffith,[4,5] who served from 1921 to 1941, and Linwood F. Tice,[6,7] from then to the present. Both men also played significant roles in the direction of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, Griffith as president (1941-1961) and Tice as dean (1959-present).

Tice assumed his editorship with mingled emotions. "To succeed a man possessing such outstanding abilities in journalism," he wrote, "is not easy, since even good copy will, by comparison, be likely to seem quite commonplace." He continued with a burst of nationalism:

> This Journal, as its name indicates, wishes to represent the interests of real American pharmacy in its entirety and its pages are open not only to contributors or scientific articles but to anyone who feels that any phase of our profession needs to be reminded of its ideals, aims or delinquencies. . . .

---

4. L. F. Tice(?), "Dr. Ivor Griffith," American Journal of Pharmacy, 113: 130, 141, April, 1941.

5. John E. Kramer, "Ivor Griffith: 1891-1961," American Journal of Pharmacy, 133: 208-210, June, 1961.

6. Jaques Cattell (ed.), American Men of Science: The Physical and Biological Sciences (tenth edition) (Tempe, Arizona: Jaques Cattell Press, Inc., 1961), III, p. 4095.

7. "Members Elect Linwood F. Tice President of APhA for 1966-67," The APhA Newsletter, 4: 1, July 17, 1965.

> Few journals today are in the unique position of being entirely free to print any article without interference or objections from any pressure group and thus does the American Journal of Pharmacy serve to maintain one of the foremost prerequisites of democracy--freedom of press . . . . This feature we shall endeavor to maintain unless the bounds of decency or common sense are exceeded . . . the only basis on which any change can be properly recommended . . . to the profession of pharmacy is not, as some think, self-interest, but whether the health and well being of the public as a whole will be improved by such change . . . this and this only is, and shall be the policy of our Journal.[8]

In 1963, a constantly increasing operational deficit made bimonthly publication a necessity. In announcing the change, Tice discussed the various alternatives that had been offered, rejecting that of being subsidized by advertising:

> We are surely not opposed to advertising . . . . There is, however, the question whether a publication paid for exclusively by this mechanism can be completely objective in its publication and editorial policy . . . subtle and undue pressure from self-interested groups from outside the profession can lead to serious consequences. Some even argue that this already has happened . . . it would be highly desirable if there were a better balance in the nature of journals read by the vast majority of pharmacists. We suggest that, in most cases, pharmacists receive and read only those publications which they get free and not even

---

8. Linwood F. Tice, "Our Policy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 113: 131-32, April, 1941.

FIGURE I

Genealogy of the American Journal of Pharmacy

Date	Title	Editor	Format
1825	Journal of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy	Daniel B. Smith	published irregularly (four numbers)
Apr. 1829		Benjamin Ellis	quarterly, 5½ by 8½ inches*
Apr. 1831		Robert E. Griffith	
Apr. 1835	American Journal of Pharmacy		
Nov. 1836		Joseph Carson	
Jul. 1850		William Procter, Jr.	
Jan. 1852			advertising department size and price changes
Jan. 1853			bimonthly
Apr. 1871		John M. Maisch	monthly
Oct. 1893		Henry Trimble	
Sept.1898		Henry Kraemer	
Nov. 1917		George M. Beringer	
Apr. 1921		Ivor Griffith	
Jan. 1927			6 by 9 inches
Apr. 1941		Linwood F. Tice	
Dec. 1963			bimonthly

*Bound

as a part of the service rendered them by a professional society.

This Journal will continue the policy which it has followed for many years. Our voice may be weak and our circulation limited, but those who have spoken the loudest and the most often throughout history have not always been right.[9]

American Professional Pharmacist

The Practical Druggist, the spiritual precursor of the American Professional Pharmacist, was established in January, 1897, by Benjamin Lillard of New York, who made it plain in his introductory editorial that he intended to publish "the most valuable and complete book of reference for the busy pharmacist ever offered to the trade."[10] In February, 1910, The Practical Druggist was acquired by the founder of its present publisher, Romaine Pierson, a sixteen-year veteran of the New York Medical Journal and American Druggist. Upon Lillard's death two months later, Charles W. Parsons,"a virile force in drug journalism,"[11] assumed the editorship, remaining until September, 1912, when he was succeeded by Otto Raubenheimer, "one of

---

9. Linwood F. Tice, "New Publication Policy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 135: 432-33, December, 1963.

10. H. S. Baketel, "Twenty-five Years in Drug Journalism," The Practical Druggist and Pharmaceutical Review of Reviews, 40: 23, January, 1922.

11. Ibid., p. 24.

Brooklyn's best-known druggists and an advocate of higher pharmacy,"[12] who resigned in February, 1914. Publisher Pierson, who felt keenly that "the average journalist is born, not made,"[13] assumed the dual role of writer-publisher until February, 1922, when he relinquished the post to Reginald E. Dyer, who had been quietly serving as associate editor since May, 1903.

In October, 1925, The Practical Druggist consolidated with Spatula, becoming The Practical Druggist and Spatula the following January, and continued under that title until its demise in January, 1935. Holland intimates that the journal's passing might indeed have been partially due to Pierson's publication policies:

> [Pierson] decided to limit The Practical Druggist's editorial and advertising pages to prescription practice. . . . [he] believed that the changing trends in pharmaceutical practice, and the replacement of compounding by increased specialty medication, rendered its existing contents as obsolete as its format. Commercial and merchandising articles and advertisements were dropped.[14]

---

12. Ibid.

13. Letter from Romaine Pierson to Willard G. Bleyer, January 27, 1913, in Kremers Historical Reference Files, Madison, Wisconsin.

14. Madeline Oxford Holland, "The Development of a Pharmaceutical Journal--the American Professional Pharmacist," (presented at the third joint session of the American Institute of the History of Pharmacy and the American Pharmaceutical Association Section on Historical Pharmacy [at the invitation of the A.I.H.P.], Salt Lake City, Utah, August 21, 1953), p. 2 of typescript in Kremers Files.

The first issue of the American Professional Pharmacist appeared in April, 1935, subsidized by a special fund set aside upon Pierson's death in 1934 by his publishing company "in recognition of the growing importance of the professional spirit in Pharmacy."[15] In a letter to Edward Kremers, Editor Dyer explained:

> The purpose of this journal will be to accelerate the present slight trend of the retail drug business back to professional pharmacy. The new journal . . . will be sent only to recognized professional pharmacies. . . .
>
> . . . Further evidence of its rigid ethical standards is in the advertising policy. It will accept only advertising of prescription specialties, ethical proprietaries, etc. NO patent medicine ads, combs, leather goods and similar merchandising items will be accepted.[16]

The following February a young pharmacist from the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy faculty joined the staff as associate editor; by June, he had been named editor. John N. McDonnell made major changes in the format of the journal and incorporated a number of special departments featuring abstract reviews and new drugs. Editorials appeared in two forms: "Editorials," short essays on

---

15. Ibid.

16. Letter from Reginald E. Dyer to Edward Kremers, April 25, 1935, in the Kremers Files.

problems facing pharmacy, and "Editorial Comment," opinionated reviews of current events relating to pharmacy. The American Professional Pharmacist was the first American pharmaceutical journal to give adequate and continued recognition to hospital pharmacy, and it was during this period that its editors became active in the initial movements which resulted in the formation of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists and the American College of Apothecaries.[17]

In September, 1941, when McDonnell requested a leave of absence to permit his participation in war agency activity in Washington, his wife (1941) and assistant editor, Madeline Oxford Holland, became managing editor with the October issue. McDonnell did not return after the war, and by July, 1947, Holland had been named editor. In 1952, she stated that the editorial policy of the American Professional Pharmacist

> has always been forthright and honest. Its editorial are a true expression of opinion and reflect the editor's considered viewpoint on Pharmacy's problems, regardless of the politics involved, and of accepted or politically expedient opinions to the contrary.
> . . . . . .
> . . . The editorial policy of the American Professional Pharmacist shall continue to be dictated not by expediency or commercialism but by the true interests of our profession.[18]

17. Holland, op. cit., p. 4.
18. Madeline Oxford Holland, "The American Professional Pharmacist," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 33, January, 1952.

In January, 1961, Irving Rubin became editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, bringing with him the aggressiveness and succinctness of style developed by twenty-two years with American Druggist. With a physical format that was smaller, bolder, and brighter, the new American Professional Pharmacist was

> a direct result of the wishes of our reader who voted overwhelmingly for a convenient, pocket-sized edition, according to extensive nationwide studies made by APP in 1960. Set in a new easy-on-the-eyes type, this issue also features compact, up-to-the-minute stories of special interest to professional-minded retail and hospital pharmacists.[19]

Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association

The idea that the American Pharmaceutical Association should publish a monthly periodical "known as The Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association" was first advanced at the 1905 meeting of the Association in Atlantic City by President James H. Beal, who argued:

> the most serious want of the Association at the present time is some cheap, convenient and frequently issued medium which will enable its members to realize that they belong to a live and active organization.[20]

---

19. "Pharmagrams," American Professional Pharmacist, 27: 1, January, 1961.

20. James H. Beal, "The President's Address," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 11, January, 1906, cited by Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 744.

FIGURE II

Genealogy of the American Professional Pharmacist

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Jan. 1897	The Practical Druggist (and Pharmaceutical Review of Reviews)	Benjamin Lillard	Monthly, 8 3/4 x 12¼ inches*
May 1903		Reginald E. Dyer (associate editor)	
Feb. 1910			Acquired by Romaine Pierson
Apr. 1910		Charles W. Parsons	
Sept. 1912		Otto Raubenheimer	
Feb. 1914		Romaine Pierson (editor-publisher)	
Feb. 1922		Reginald E. Dyer	
Oct. 1925			consolidated with Spatula
Jan. 1926	The Practical Druggist and Spatula		
Jan. 1935			discontinued publication
Apr. 1935	American Professional Pharmacist	Reginald E. Dyer, Dr. A. C. Michelson, Dr. J. L. Dardream, Dr. C. Leonard O'Connell (editorial board)	monthly, 6 x 9 inches
Dec. 1935		also: Dr. A. Richard Bliss, Dr. Leonard J. Piccoli	
Feb. 1936		John N. McDonnell (associate editor)	
Jun. 1936		John N. McDonnell	
Apr. 1941		Madeline Oxford Holland (assistant editor)	

FIGURE II - Cont.

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Oct. 1941		Madeline Oxford Holland (managing editor)	
Jul. 1947		Madeline Oxford Holland	
Jan. 1961		Irving Rubin	5¼ x 7 3/4 inches

*Bound

Beal's proposal, it is noted, was "carried with applause."[21] However, it was Henry H. Rusby who provided the impetus to convert the Bulletin into something quite new in his president's address at the Richmond meeting in 1910,[22] Acting accordingly, the committee on the Bulletin played a series of concrete proposals before the council: the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association would include editorials, original articles, and pharmaceutical abstracts, while at the same time it absorbed the Proceedings. Unlike the Bulletin, the Journal would carry advertising, but copy and contributed papers would be reviewed against a code of standards. In a supplemental report the committee concluded that "the American Pharmaceutical Association will never command the influence it would or should until it has an official organ of its own."[23] The proposals "evoked considerable discussion" in the council meeting, but were finally adopted at the close of the meeting with a resolution that

> editorials be limited to synoptical references to the contents of the current Journal, and that on stated questions

---

21. Sonnedecker, loc. cit., citing Edward Kremers, "Report of Committee on President's Address," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 16, January, 1906.

22. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 745, citing Henry H. Rusby, "President's Address," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 58: 437, 1910.

23. J. W. England, "Supplemental Report of the Committee on Bulletin," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 58: 510, 1910.

> such expressions be confined to the attitude of the association, if made at all.[24]

This editorial hobble was directed at the colorful editor of the Bulletin, C. S. N. Hallberg, who had also been elected with some misgivings to become editor-in-chief of the proposed Journal. Before the question could be resolved, however, Hallberg died in October of a brain tumor.[25]

By June, 1911, it was perfectly clear that the first issue of the Journal would not be off the press in July, as originally scheduled. The council now agreed with the committee on publications that the first issue be deferred until January, 1912, and that the "entire subject of the Journal be reconsidered" by the council at the annual meeting in Boston.[26] Joseph W. England, now chairman of the committee and acting editor of the Bulletin gave up his own editorial aspirations[27] and revived his former suggestion to combine the posts of general secretary and

---

24. Sonnedecker, loc. cit., citing J. W. England, "Minutes of the Second Session of the New Council," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 58: 517, 1910.

25. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 744-745. Also see a letter from Joseph W. England to H. M. Whelpley, August 31, 1910, in Kremers Files.

26. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 776, citing "A.Ph.A. Council Letter No. 27," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 6: 321, July, 1911.

27. Sonnedecker, loc. cit. Also see letter from M. G. Motter to the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association, November 1, 1910, in Kremers Files.

editor.[28] In Boston, Joseph Remington nominated council chairman Beal to the dual post, and he was unanimously elected as the sole nominee. Beal's first editorial proclaimed:

> The Journal is not an object but an instrument. The American Pharmaceutical Association does not exist for the purpose of producing this publication, but the latter has been brought into existence to serve the necessities of the Association. . . .
>
> The prime object of the Journal is to furnish a more direct and speedy means of communication between the Association and its members than is possible through the columns of the other pharmaceutical journals. . . .
>
> . . . the Journal will not, under its present editorial control, attempt to enter the field served by the general pharmaceutical press.
> .....
>
> According to a resolution adopted at the Richmond convention, and as yet not formally repealed, 'editorials shall be limited to syntopical references to the current Journal, and on stated questions must be confined to the attitude of the Association.'
>
> This resolution, so much of it as is understandable, would, if literally interpreted, reduce editorial utterances to mere perfunctory expressions which might as well be left unexpressed. The editor will presume, therefore, to adopt a somewhat more liberal construction, and will proceed upon the theory that he is to have "reasonable latitude of action," always acknowledging full responsibility to

---

28. Much of the preceding account and documentation concerning the early history of the Journal is based upon Glenn Sonnedecker,"The Journal Is Born," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 744-745, 776-777, December, 1961.

> the Association for the manner in which he shall exercise his discretion.[29]

Beal resigned as editor in June, 1914, because of poor health, and after a year under the acting editorship of Ernest C. Marshall, the editorial duties for the ensuing twenty-three years were assumed by Eugene G. Eberle, who philosophized:

> The work of the Editor is largely to co-ordinate the expressed desires of the member relating to the conduct of the Journal and the Association, perhaps to offer suggestions and ideas for development. He speaks only as an individual, though his efforts are assumed to present the views of many.[30]

During the 1920's and 1930's, the Journal assumed a dominant position among the professional journals as a scientific and reference publication. There was a rapid increase in the number of scientific papers submitted for publication and a growing need to give adequate attention to current events in pharmacy, especially the rapidly expanding activities of the Association. Upon Eberle's retirement in August, 1939, Secretary E. F. Kelly acted as editor for sixteen months, until the increasing volume

---

29. J. H. Beal, "The Policy of the Journal," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 1,3, January, 1912.

30. E. G. Eberle, "The Editorship of the Journal," The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 4: 606, May, 1915. The following account of the later history of the Journal is based upon "Guides to the Journal's Destiny," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 746-748, December, 1961.

of material forced the creation of two editions of the Journal in January, 1940. In his initial editorial, Kelly predicted that

> the Practical Pharmacy Edition will appeal strongly to the practicing pharmacists in every branch of the profession since it will deal with their professional problems, will serve them in promoting professional service of every type and will give publicity to the activities of the Association as well as to other professional trends and events of national importance.[31]

The Scientific Edition also made its appearance at this time, edited by A. G. DuMez, and continued the numbering of the old Journal.

In January of the following year, Kelly stepped down in favor of Robert W. Rodman, former managing editor of The Druggists Circular, whose experience was soon reflected in a decidedly modern format, for his time, effective illustrations, bold mastheads, and his objective, "the publication of the most practical, usable, professional journal available to the pharmacist to-day."[32] When Rodman resigned in September, 1943, to become an account

---

31. E. F. Kelly, "The Scientific and Practical Pharmacy Editions of the Journal," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 1: 3, January, 1940.

32. Robert W. Rodman, "On the Beam," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 2: 3, January, 1941.

executive for Murray Breese and Associates, Glenn Sonnedecker, a syndicated pharmacist-writer from the editorial staff of Science Service, Washington, D.C., took the reins, and promised that the Journal

> will continue to be the professional publication of the retail and hospital pharmacist--practical in both the pharmaceutical and dictionary sense. Based on Association ideals, lifted with the rising tide of pharmacy, the Journal can be expected to become an increasingly important aid to professional practice.33

Sonnedecker made several important changes in the Journal, limited as he was by wartime restrictions. His editorials appeared under the title, "The Way It Looks To Us," through May, 1945, which issue marked the first "Straight from Headquarters" column by Secretary Robert P. Fischelis. In January, 1948, the Practical Pharmacy Edition took on a new look with a better grade of paper, improved typography and illustrations, as well as new and revised editorial features. In October, however, Sonnedecker left to take up graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin under Dr. George Urdang.

For the next two years, the masthead carried Harold V. Darnell variously as "acting editor," "associate

---

33. Glenn Sonnedecker, "Extending Editorial Service," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 4: 303, October, 1943.

editor," "pharmacy editor," and, finally, "editor," but it was Fischelis as editorial director--and later as editor--who wielded the real power, for as he remarked upon his retirement,

> the Secretary . . . has a particularly close association with This Journal because it is the official organ of the Association and . . . he is considered the spokesman of the Association on matters of policy. . . . "Straight from Headquarters" has combined editorial expression with information on matters of policy and actions of the Association, its Council, and the House of Delegates.[34]

In April, 1956, the editorship passed into the hands of Eric W. Martin, former professor at the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science and editor of Remington's Practice of Pharmacy. In introducing Martin, Fischelis listed the qualifications for the position:

> [The] editor of This Journal must be a man with a basic training in pharmacy and [a] broad scientific, professional and cultural background. He must be thoroughly familiar with the problems of the practicing pharmacist as well as of the drug industry and be able to produce and supply factual, authentic and usable information which will enable pharmacists to keep abreast of the rapidly changing developments in medical care, public health, the practice of

---

34. Robert P. Fischelis, "Valedictory," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 20: 503, September, 1959.

> medicine and pharmacy, and in the allied sciences and professions.[35]

In his first editorial, Martin "accepted the . . . challenge" implied in the words of the Journal's masthead:

> This Journal . . . . is devoted to the education of pharmaceutical practitioners, and it functions as the professional voice of pharmacy which is directed to all members of the profession in education, government, industry and professional practice.[36]

Martin guided the Journal until July, 1959. The following month, new A.Ph.A. Secretary William S. Apple was named editorial director and, in September, editor. Apple, like Fischelis, used his dual post to advance the Association's policies and objectives:

> It would appear to me that if we collectively utilized the intelligence and energy which the individual facets now expend in family skirmishing, we would . . . achieve . . . major objectives of a more positive character. The social as well as the professional functions which we cannot perform . . . as individuals demand that we unite.[37]

---

35. Robert P. Fischelis, "Dr. Martin Becomes Editor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 17: 219, April, 1956.

36. Eric W. Martin, "Editorials," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 18: 26, January, 1957.

37. William S. Apple, "Dr. Apple Accepts Secretaryship," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Practical Pharmacy Edition, 20: 500, September, 1959.

In January, 1962, George B. Griffenhagen, who had served as managing editor under Apple, assumed the top editorial post. His initial editorial, too, hammered home the need for organization:

> The growing recognition by pharmacists of the absolute necessity for . . . establishing . . . organization within the profession . . . is most encouraging.
>
> The second step requires the implementation of such a program through local and state leadership. . . . The elected leaders in pharmacy must build such a structure . . . . The future of the profession rests on their efforts.[38]

N.A.R.D. Journal

Prior to October, 1902, N.A.R.D. Notes had its existence as the product of a typewriter instead of a printing press. Charles M. Carr, a veteran newspaperman and free-lance political writer, was employed to visit the headquarters of the National Association of Retail Druggists once a week and there gather information and inspiration for two pages of typewritten matter headed "N.A.R.D. Notes," fourteen copies of which were distributed to the pharmaceutical journals of the country with the request that they print them under the heading designated, or that they be worked over and made use of

---

38. George B. Griffenhagen, "Too Many Organizations ... Or Too Little Organization," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 11, January, 1962.

FIGURE III

Genealogy of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Jan. 1906	Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Vol. I	C. S. N. Hallberg	Monthly, 6½ by 9½ inches
Oct. 1910		J. W. England	
Jan. 1912	Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Vol. I	James H. Beal	
Jun. 1914		Ernest C. Marshall (acting editor)	
May 1915		Eugene G. Eberle	
Aug. 1938		E. F. Kelly (acting editor)	
Jan. 1940	Practical Pharmacy Edition, Vol. I		7 by 10 inches
Jan. 1941		Robert W. Rodman	
Oct. 1943		Glenn Sonnedecker	
Nov. 1948		Harold V. Darnell (acting editor)	
Jan. 1949		(editorial staff)	
Feb. 1949		(associate editor) Robert P. Fischelis (editorial director)	

FIGURE III - Cont.

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Jun. 1949		Harold V. Darnell (Pharmacy editor)	
Feb. 1950		Harold V. Darnell	
Feb. 1951		Robert P. Fischelis	
Apr. 1956		Eric W. Martin	
Jan. 1957			8½ by 11 inches
Aug. 1959		William S. Apple (editorial director)	
Sept.1959		William S. Apple George B. Griffenhagen (managing editor)	
Jan. 1961	New Series, Vol. NS1		
Jan. 1962		George B. Griffenhagen	

as original material. The "Notes" were apparently well received, but Secretary Thomas V. Wooten, feeling that the N.A.R.D. required more publicity than it was receiving, proposed a "Greater Notes." "Greater Notes," in this instance, meant four pages of typewritten material instead of two. In October, 1902, Carr had the material set in type at a local law printing office. The pages of the printed version of N.A.R.D. Notes were printed on one side only for the convenience of the editors who continued to use the material as fillers. Disappointed by the lack of increased publicity expected by the new format, a department of publicity was organized, and a field force began taking subscriptions for the Notes, "A weekly illustrated pharmaceutical journal devoted to the organizational, educational, and commercial interests of the retail drug trade."

The Notes eventually grew to sixty-four pages, the second "Greater Notes" authorized by the Atlantic City convention in 1908, and its revenues were used to prevent the diminuation of N.A.R.D. activities and made "propaganda" of U.S.P. and N.F. preparations and other education material possible. At Carr's suggestion, the title of the publication was changed to The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists in June, 1913. Carr, however, resigned the following January, and at his testimonial remarked unabashedly:

> This Journal of the N.A.R.D. that I have founded for you and nurtured for you for eleven years, I want to be as big a winner without me as with me . . . . I want to point to The N.A.R.D. Journal as the greatest journal in its field . . . and . . . as a monument to eleven years of successful work on my part.[39]

Hugh Craig, of the staff of Druggists' Circular, took Carr's place, stating in his first editorial that

> The aims of the association should be the purpose of the Journal. Broad enough are these, to be a field of endeavor for the most strenuous; worthy enough are they, to enthuse any worker in the cause of pharmacy and to lend power to any pen.[40]

When Craig resigned in April, 1918, new N.A.R.D. Secretary Samuel S. Henry was thrown into the breech, and explained:

> It is impossible at this time to state just when this vacancy will be filled. In the meantime, however, you can rest assured that we will continue to willingly and cheerfully do our very best.[41]

Henry continued in this "temporary" capacity until his retirement in 1933, setting a pattern for subsequent secretary-editors.

---

39. "A Notable Session of the National Executive Committee," The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists, 17: 790-791, January 1, 1914. Also see Charles M. Carr, "Genesis of the Journal of the N.A.R.D.," pp. 777-780.

40. Hugh Craig, "Salutory," The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists, 17: 833, January 8, 1914.

41. Samuel C. Henry, "Secretary's Report," N.A.R.D. Journal, 26: 1265, September 26, 1918.

John W. Dargavel was listed as editor from July to October, 1933, and is credited with inaugurating the column "Editorial Comment" and, later, "Editorially Speaking," which persisted as the only editorial voice of the Journal until 1945. During this period, George A. Bender had quietly served as editor, being joined by Theodore Christianson as associate editor in November, 1940. When Bender left in October, 1945, Christianson became editor, and started his own column, "From the Editor's Desk," the following month. Apparently Christianson was not sure of his editorial position, the column being listed variously as "From the Editor's Chair," "Across the Editor's Desk," "Across the Editor's Chair," and, finally, "At the Editor's Desk." Peter J. Sletterdahl joined the staff as associate editor in October, 1947, and the following year saw his column, "Tick Tock," alternating with Christianson's. "Tick Tock" gave way to "Peter Sletterdahl's Memo Pad" and finally to "At the Editor's Desk with Pete Sletterdahl" in November, 1948 when he was appointed editor, but the column disappeared at the end of 1952. "Editorial Comments," short, terse, unsigned comments on the news in pharmacy appeared during 1953, and later, "Postscripts and Viewpoints." When Sletterdahl was appointed editorial director in January, 1954, no editorials appeared until his reinstatement as editor the following June.

Several subtle changes in format are noted during this period. The N.A.R.D.'s famous motto, "to live and let live," which first appeared in December, 1902, persisted until December, 1921, when it was replaced by the more fraternal "to live and help to live." The latter phrase disappeared from the masthead in December, 1932. The Depression ushered in other changes: Readers of the January, 1932 issue saw a new format, a larger page size, and an announcement that the Journal was now to be published semi-monthly. The subtitle, "The Druggists' Own Publication," appeared in January, 1938, and persisted through July, 1953, being replaced by "Prestige Through Leadership for Over Half a Century." This prestige was apparently short-lived, for the January 4, 1954 issue of the N.A.R.D. Journal was no less modestly subtitled, "The Most Powerful Force in the Drug Field."

American Druggist

The genealogy of the American Druggist is one of the more tortuous of the American pharmaceutical journals we have examined. A few numbers of New Remedies, American Druggist's direct precursor, appeared in 1871. The following year, the little journal appeared regular as "A Quarterly Retrospect of Therapeutics, Pharmacy, and Allied Subjects." A monthly by 1876, New Remedies had grown in both size and in stature: current scientific

FIGURE IV

Genealogy of the N.A.R.D. Journal

Date	Title	Editor	Format
	N.A.R.D. Notes	Charles M. Carr	2 typewritten pages; weekly
			"greater Notes" proposal (4 typewritten pages)
Oct. 1902			8 printed pages, 6½ by 9 3/4 inches*
Mar. 1903°			16 printed pages
Oct. 1905°			20 printed pages
Mar. 1908°			24 printed pages
Aug. 1908°			32 printed pages
Sept.1908			second "greater Notes" proposal; 64 or more pages authorized
Jun. 1913	Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists		
Jan. 1914		Hugh Craig	
Jan. 1915	N.A.R.D. Journal		7 1/4 by 10 inches*
Apr. 1918		Samuel C. Henry	
Jan. 1932			semi-monthly, 8½ by 11 inches
Jul. 1933		John W. Dargavel	
Nov. 1933		George A. Bender	

FIGURE IV - Cont.

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Dec. 1934		John W. Dargavel (managing editor)	
Oct. 1935		(executive secretary and general manager)	
Nov. 1940		(editorial director) Theodore Christianson (associate editor)	
Oct. 1945		Theodore Christianson	
Oct. 1947		Peter J. Sletterdahl (associate editor)	
Nov. 1948		Peter J. Sletterdahl	
Jan. 1954		(editorial director)	
Jun. 1954		Peter J. Sletterdahl	

°First regular appearance.

*Bound.

works were now reviewed, pharmacy replaced materia medica as the main branch of endeavor, and the metric system and the new chemical nomenclature were adopted. In January, 1884, the publication appeared as American Druggist, "An Illustrated Monthly Journal of Pharmacy, Chemistry, and Materia Medica." Up to this time, strong emphasis had been placed on pharmacology; however, with the appearance of "numerous medical journals,"[42] the content reflected a shift toward pharmacy and medicinal chemistry.

When Caswell A. Mayo, former editor of Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter and Merck's Market Report, became editor in July, 1892, a new tack was readily apparent; American Druggist was now "A Journal of Practical Pharmacy," and the editors announced

> In the past this journal has been recognized as the leading exponent of purely scientific pharmaceutical knowledge . . . This feature will be maintained under the new management, but in addition cognizance will also be taken of purely trade matters which, while having no scientific bearing, are nevertheless of vital importance to the welfare of its constituents.[43]

April of 1893 saw the consolidation of American Druggist with Pharmaceutical Record. The combined journal was

---

42. Frederick A. Castle(?), "Ourselves," American Druggist, 13: 10, January, 1884.

43. Caswell A. Mayo(?), "A Statement," American Druggist, 22: 1, July, 1892.

issued weekly, and had a larger circulation than that of "any other drug journal in the world."[44] The winds had not changed by 1911, but had gained velocity:

> Some years ago the American Druggist inaugurated a department of business building devoted to a study of drug trade advertising and to suggestions for improving the commercial side of the retail drug business. Interest in this department has grown steadily and we have added to it chapters on accounting, on window dressing and on other phases of the commercial side of pharmacy with most satisfactory results to our readers.[45]

An interesting letter from Mayo during this period shows a certain dissatisfaction with his work:

> To the young man who contemplates engaging in pharmaceutical journalism I feel like repeating Mr. Puck's advice to a young man about to be married, "Don't."
>
> . . . Pharmaceutical journalism is a very narrow field . . . the editors have other sources of income, and in most cases their main source of income is outside of journalism. With all save a few . . . journalism is an avocation and not a vocation . . . . I do not think that any drug journal in the United States pays its editor more than $3000 a year . . .
>
> . . . I know of no trade journal field which holds so little promise of a future as does the pharmaceutical field.

---

44. Caswell A. Mayo(?), "Announcement," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 22: 189-190, April 21, 1893.

45. Caswell A. Mayo(?), "The 'American Druggist' as a Monthly," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 59: 30, October, 1911.

> If your graduate would wish to go into class journalism at all by all means take up some field in which there is a prospect of further extension, such as the automobile field or the electrical field.[46]

Mayo resigned as editor in June, 1919, to accept a position with the Wm. S. Merrell Company. His successor, Charles W. Parsons, a former member of the scientific staff of E. R. Squibb & Sons, had gained considerable experience as editor of Druggists' Circular, Practical Druggist, and Pharmaceutical Era. When Parsons returned to Squibb in June, 1926, Mayo returned from Merrell to pick up the reins. In July of the following year, American Druggist was purchased by International Publications, Inc., William Randolph Hearst, president. Murray Breese, former managing editor of Drug Topics, was appointed editor, Mayo having been relegated to the relative oblivion of contributing editor. The first editorial in the "new" American Druggist hinted at the change:

> It will be filled with BUSINESS information and no matter who you are, where you are, or what you do, if you're a PHARMACEUTICAL BUSINESS MAN you'll want to read it.[47]

---

46. Letter from Caswell A. Mayo to Edward Kremers, February 27, 1913, in Kremers Files.

47. Murray Breese(?), "New Times, New Conditions, New Needs and a New American Druggist," American Druggist, 76: 11, July, 1927.

The next two decades proved to be the most turbulent in the history of the American Druggist. Under the Hearst aegis, "The Pharmaceutical Business Paper," as it was now styled, emerged as a sensational combination of commercialism and chauvinism, ground into a pharmaceutical pulp. Scientific papers had all but disappeared; in their wake were bold display types, endless pictorials, and even a little cheesecake, not to mention the "cute" full-color covers by Robert "Robbie" Robinson.

Breese left in November, 1929, being replaced by managing editor Herbert R. Mayes. Howard Stephanson joined the staff as managing editor in December, 1932, only to replace Mayes in September, 1934, when the latter left to become editor of Pictorial Review and eventually Good Housekeeping. In order to avoid confusion, the January, 1936 editorial was titled "Howard Stephanson's Editorial." For the next two years, however, no editorials at all appeared having been temporarily replaced by a column of capsule comments, "Our Front Window." Stephanson left in June, 1937, having been replaced by Louis J. F. Moore. Moore added another three-quarters of an inch to the height of the journal and a series of highly stylized "modern art" covers.

Kenneth A. Bonham took the editorial reins in November, 1938, relinquishing them to Howard W. Hutchins in December, 1941. The editorial power, however, was wielded by the new

editor-in-chief, John W. McPherrin.

McPherrin brought editorials back to the American Druggist, first as "This Pharmacy Business" and later as "This Drug Business," short comments on current events affecting pharmacy. McPherrin was an able editor, for the Hearst management was no longer rotating a series of editors through American Druggist merely to give them experience in editing a business magazine. But when the management announced that McPherrin would be transferred to Cosmopolitan in order to help that magazine sell its drug trade public relations program, McPherrin balked, resigning to become vice president of Crowell-Collier Publishing Company and publisher of The American Magazine.

> If as editor of American Druggist I have shown some understanding of people and of America, it is because of the freedom you gave me to express my faith in druggists as people--and particularly as hometown people who believe in America.[48]

Such hyper-patriotism was not at all unusual during the early 1950's.

"The NEW American Druggist," the December, 1951 issue enthused, "will make the following vital contributions:"

---

48. John W. McPherrin, "This Drug Business," American Druggist, 124: 182, September, 1951.

> It will seek the significant news of the drug industry. It will tell you what it means...and show you what can be done about it.
>
> It will dig out every basic product trend, every fundamental merchandising trend. It will point up each trend...explain it...and show how to capitalize on it.
>
> It will be alert to every vital development in professional pharmacy. It will present these developments quickly... accurately...so that druggists may truly become reliable information headquarters to the medical men and the communities they serve.
>
> It will assemble authentic solutions to all basic drug store problems...whether concerned with professional pharmacy or the everyday problems of buying and selling.
>
> It will give the serious-minded druggist of America every bit of information... every kind of help...they need in order to operate most efficiently.
>
> In the NEW American Druggist, there will be no waste words, no idle comments. Ideas and reports will be presented crisply...clearly...swiftly...and will be highlighted by important diagrams as well as by dramatic photographs.[49]

The new editor, of course, was Dan Rennick, who applied his twenty-four years of experience with Drug Topics to the greatest advantage possible. Abandoning the American Magazine-type format of McPherrin, Rennick

---

49. "On Jan. 7, 1952...," American Druggist, 124: 1, December, 1951.

transformed it into a pharmacist's Time, which now appeared biweekly. Only Irving Rubin, associate editor since 1939, survived the changeover, appearing on the new masthead as managing editor of pharmacy. It is no wonder that in fulfilling the above promises, editorials disappeared for five years. The first "Straight Talk" column appeared January 14, 1957:

> These paragraphs can best be described as footnotes to the news, the analyses, and the carefully prepared trend pieces which appear in every issue of the American Druggist.
>
> Sometimes these paragraphs will be literal "asides" by the editor--the kind of things that you yourself may think of, but never voice, when you listen to someone spout an opinion,
> .....
>
> But regardless of what they deal with, these paragraphs will be direct and straightforward. There will be no double meanings and no pussy-footing.
>
> In short, these paragraphs will be straight talk--talk you can bank on... clear as well as incisive...honest as well as pointed.[50]

Drug Topics

Drug Topics, "A Journal of Current Drug News and Prices," first appeared in 1886 as a bimonthly, and

---

50. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk," American Druggist, 135: 6, January 14, 1957.

FIGURE V

Genealogy of the *American Druggist*

Date	Title	Editor	Format
1871	*New Remedies*		published irregularly
1872		Dr. Horatio C. Wood, Jr.	quarterly 5 1/4 by 8 1/4 inches*
1873		Dr. Frederick A. Castle	
1876			monthly 7 by 10 inches*
Jan. 1884	*American Druggist*		8 1/4 by 13 1/2 inches*
Jan. 1892			biweekly 8½ by 11 3/4 inches*
Jan. 1892			acquired by American Druggist Publishing Co.
Jul. 1892		Caswell A. Mayo	monthly
Apr. 1893	*American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record*		consolidated with *Pharmaceutical Record*; weekly
Jul. 1894			semi-monthly
Oct. 1911			monthly
Jun. 1919		Charles W. Parsons	
Jan. 1923	*American Druggist*		
Jun. 1926		Caswell A. Mayo	

FIGURE V - Cont.

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Jul. 1927		(contributing editor) Murray Breese	acquired by International Publications, Inc.
Nov. 1929		Herbert R. Mayes	
Jan. 1931			8½ by 11 inches
Sept.1934		Howard Stephanson	
Jun. 1937		Louis J. F. Moore	
Jul. 1937			9 by 12 inches
Nov. 1938		Kenneth A. Bonham	
Dec. 1941		Howard W. Hutchins John W. McPherrin (editor-in-chief)	
Jan. 1942			8½ by 11 inches
Jan. 1952		Dan Rennick	biweekly
Jan. 1957			first "Straight Talk" column

*bound

later, a biweekly house organ of McKesson & Robbins, edited by E. H. Gane.[51] Unsigned editorials appeared at least by February, 1898, and by the end of 1905 the small journal proclaimed itself as being "Devoted to Scientific Matters of Interest to the Drug Trade." In January, 1913, Drug Topics became a "Monthly Magazine for Chemists, Pharmacists and Druggists," and shrank to pocket size. An editorial in the December, 1915 issue heralded a change in policy:

> "Drug Topics" in the future will be written largely in the interest of the Retail Clerk . . . .
>
> We have come to regard the drug clerks as our best distributors, for we realize that the clerk is the man who eventually sells most of our goods. It is this feeling that has prompted us to make the foregoing announcement.[52]

During 1918, "Clerks" became "Salesmen" on the masthead, which in November proclaimed that Drug Topics was edited by "Jerry McQuade, journalist," the name which Francis P. McQuade had been advised to assume and later copyright.

By 1920, McQuade was listed as "A Greek In Love With His Work," and his publication as the "National Magazine

---

51. Frederick Hoffman, "A Century of American Pharmaceutical Literature and Journalism," American Druggist, 36: 165, March 26, 1900.

52. E. H. Gane(?), "In the Interest of the Clerk," Drug Topics, 30: 1, December, 1915.

of the Drug Trade," with a circulation of over 50,000 monthly.[53] Editorials now appeared in a variety of forms: "Editorials by Jerry McQuade" merely consisted of a series of one-line quips, comments, and quotes, also titled "'Jerryisms' With a Punch." Toward the end of 1921 the column "Jerry Says" began to appear with some frequency, and was actually opinionated feature articles on such diverse subject matter as competition, prohibition, and the infidelity of pharmacists' wives, which was blamed on long store hours. By September, 1923, "Drug Topicals: Undoing the Doings of the Day" was fixed as the appropriate title for the rambling editorials, and persisted throughout the next ten years.

It was during this period of growth and expansion that Drug Topics, in April, 1926, acquired as service manager, Murray Breese, "A Spartan Whose Passion is Good Advertising Copy." Promoted to associate editor in August, his passion was noted as having switched to "News." Breese left the following February to become editor of American Druggist, creating a remarkably constant pattern. In January, 1928, Dan Rennick joined the staff as associate editor, becoming managing editor in August of the following year. The January 8, 1934

---

53. Jerry McQuade(?), "Now the National Magazine of the Drug Trade," Drug Topics, 36: 3, March, 1920.

issue of Drug Topics appeared as a tabloid newspaper--"one of the boldest and most successful new departures ever made in tradepaper publishing":[54]

> As a newspaper it will be the virile, vibrant mirror of the news of the trade and its voice in all things pertaining to the betterment of the retail druggists.[55]

Upon McQuade's death in November, 1938, Rennick continued as managing editor, but it was Dr. Robert W. Swain, a past president of the American Pharmaceutical Association and pharmacy editor since 1934, who was appointed editor the following February:

> I am conscious that, with the power of DRUG TOPICS behind me . . . my opportunities to work for the betterment of pharmacy and for the improvement in the economic conditions under which it is carried on will be greatly multiplied.[56]

At the same time, Rennick was promoted to the post of editorial director, a position he was to hold until his resignation in August, 1951 to assume the reins of

---

54. "Jerry McQuade Is Dead at 63," Drug Topics, 54: 14, November 14, 1938.

55. Jerry McQuade, "Drug Topics Becomes a Newspaper," Drug Topics, 50: 38, January 8, 1934.

56. "Drug Topics' New Editor Is Dr. Swain," Drug Topics, 55: 16, February 13, 1939.

American Druggist. In 1941, Drug Topics combined with the floundering Druggists' Circular and assumed its numbering, but at the height of the war, an acute paper shortage forced Drug Topics to publish "fortnightly--every other week--," it explained, "throughout the emergency," and continued parenthetically:

> (We could have saved paper by cutting circulation. But we chose not to do so, for we know that druggists everywhere rely on DRUG TOPICS, more than ever, for the latest news from Washington, for reports on the newest government orders, for stories on how to meet the multitude of problems created by war.)
>
> . . . We will print shorter stories--but more of them.[57]

Louis Kazin appears on the January 11, 1954 masthead as associated editor, and as editor, upon Swain's promotion to editor-in-chief in January, 1959. Kazin's editorials typically centered on one main theme in contrast to the four or more topics discussed in every issue by Swain. Swain remained editor-in-chief until failing health in June of 1961 forced him to become "Corresponding Editor" and, finally, "Contributing Editor" in April, 1962, in which capacity he remained until his retirement in January, 1963. In November, 1961, the Topics Publishing Company was acquired as a jointly-owned subsidiary of

---

57. Robert L. Swain(?), "We Will Save Paper for the Duration But We'll Publish the Same Drug Topics," Drug Topics, 87: 1, July 12, 1943.

Modern Medicine, Inc. of Minneapolis and the Chilton Company of Philadelphia, but Drug Topics continued to operate autonomously as "The Newspaper for Retail Druggists."[58]

58. "Drug Topics Gets Support of Top Firms," Drug Topics, 105: 2, November 20, 1961.

FIGURE VI

Genealogy of Drug Topics

Date	Title	Editor	Format
1886	Drug Topics	E. H. Gane	7 1/4 by 9 1/2 inches* bimonthly-biweekly organ of McKesson & Robbins
Jul. 1898			acquired by Drug Topics Publishing Company
Jan. 1915			4½ by 6 inches* monthly
Nov. 1918	McK&R Drug Topics	Jerry McQuade	
1919	Drug Topics		acquired by McQuade and several partners
Mar. 1920			5 by 8 inches; distributed by McKesson & Robbins, Inc.
1921			acquired by Aglar Cook Topics Publishing Co.
Jan. 1928		Dan Rennick (associate editor)	
Jan. 1934		Dr. Robert W. Swain (pharmacy editor)	tabloid newspaper; weekly
Nov. 1938		Dan Rennick (managing editor)	
Feb. 1939		Dr. Robert W. Swain	
Jan. 1941			combined with Druggists' Circular
Jul. 1943			fortnightly

FIGURE VI - Cont.

Date	Title	Editor	Format
Jan. 1954		Louis Kazin (associate editor)	
Jan. 1959		Louis Kazin Dr. Robert W. Swain (editor-in-chief)	
Jun. 1961		(corresponding editor)	
Nov. 1961			acquired by Modern Medicine, Inc. and Chilton Company
Apr. 1962		(contributing editor)	
Jan. 1963		(retired)	

*bound

CHAPTER IV

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT CATEGORIES BY FIVE-YEAR PERIODS

During the coding procedure all editorial subjects encountered were tallied both by period and by journal and several sets of tables developed. This chapter will deal only with general subject trends apparent over the five five-year periods considered. Subject trends by journal will be discussed in Chapter V, allowing the reader to become familiar with the general trend data before proceeding to detailed discussions of specific subject areas in subsequent chapters.

Table I shows the combined categories of analysis by period. Several general trends are apparent. First, although the number of editorials drawn in each period is relatively constant (average = 283), the number of subjects discussed in the editorials decreases dramatically from 965 during the period 1920-24 to 348 during 1960-64, the only variation from this pattern occurring during 1950-54. The variation in the number of editorials drawn may be attributed to corresponding variations in publication schedules, however, the decrease in the number of subjects discussed per editorial--a drop from 3.4 during the period 1920-24 to 1.3 during 1960-64--shows a definite trend from several

short announcements of fact and opinion to longer, in-depth reviews of only one or two specific subjects. This finding may be colored by the fact that, in general, editorials decreased in length during the same periods, although no data on editorial length were compiled.

Secondly, it is interesting to note that by far the most-discussed topic in the editorials was legislation affecting pharmacy, which accounted for 789, or 26.1 per cent of the total number of subjects (3024). Administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy was the second most-discussed topic, accounting for 508, or 16.8 per cent of the total, and discussions of the profession and the practice of pharmacy placed third with 502, or 16.6 per cent of the total. The remaining 40.5 per cent of the subjects, in order of their popularity with pharmacy journal editors were: pharmacy organizations, 11.7 per cent; government and pharmacy, 10.0 per cent; pharmaceutical literature, 8.0 per cent; research, discovery and invention in pharmacy, 4.2 per cent; pharmaceutical education, 4.1 per cent, and other subjects, 2.5 per cent. Rank order correlations[1] between the percentages in the total column and those in the individual period columns are quite significant:

---

1. Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958), pp. 158-60.

Period	Rank Order Correlation
1920-24	.78
1930-34	.97
1940-44	.73
1950-54	.97
1960-64	.92

Table II permits a detailed examination of the 789 editorial topics dealing with some form of legislation affecting pharmacy. It is interesting to note that nearly one-half (382) were found in the period 1920-24, and that of these, 213, or 55.8 per cent, were concerned with some aspect of prohibition. This preoccupation with the unpopular Nineteenth Amendment decreased to 14.7 per cent during 1930-34 and then, of course, disappeared. The data on legislation also reflects the decrease in the number of topics discussed in editorials over the years. In this case, the exception during the period 1950-54 may be explained by the large number of editorials dealing with fair trade and price maintenance and control (53 out of 137, or 38.7 per cent) and with Durham-Humphrey legislation (29 out of 137, or 21.2 per cent), fully three-fifths of the editorials dealing with legislation during this period. Interestingly enough, almost the same amount of concern over price maintenance was expressed during the early years of the Depression; 39.7 per cent (54 out of 136) of the editorials

concerning legislation during 1930-34 dealt with this topic. Editorials dealing with state boards of pharmacy remained fairly constant over the first four periods (average = 11.1 per cent), but dropped to only 1.8 per cent of the legislative coverage during 1960-64. Editorial concern with narcotic license renewal and control decreased over the five periods from 9.4 per cent during 1920-24 to 1.8 per cent during 1960-64. Court decisions affecting pharmacy, however, which had averaged only 2.9 per cent of the editorial attention paid to legislation during the first three periods, jumped to 13.9 per cent during 1950-54 and 47.3 per cent during 1960-64.

Of the 508 editorials which dealt with administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy, nearly one-third were concerned with some form of merchandising (see Table III). With the exception of 1930-34, during which time only twenty editorials concerning merchandising appeared, the pattern is fairly constant. Editorials about the closely-related topics of business, advertising and promotion, and competition assumed secondary importance, but combined with those concerning merchandising total over three-quarters of the editorials in this category. Business topics reached their peak during the period 1940-44 (25.6 per cent), decreasing to 5.7 per cent by 1960-64. The pattern of editorials dealing with advertising and promotion is not remarkable

except for the scant (2.7 per cent) attention paid to it during 1940-44, during which time advertising was discouraged as a patriotic gesture to conserve paper; besides, many lines such as rubber goods were rationed and in short supply and needed little, if any, promotion. Editorials dealing with aspects of competition reached their peak during the period 1930-34 (21.5 per cent), as might be expected during a major depression. Likewise, editors were more concerned with price cutting and price fixing during the early 1930's than during any other period, discussion on the subjects actually disappearing by the early 1950's. Mail-order-prescription schemes, which are also included in this sub-group, caused a significant rise in editorial coverage in this category during their inception in the early 1960's.

The editorial sub-groups gathered under the category dealing with the profession and practice of pharmacy do not exhibit the periodic decrease to which we have become accustomed, but following a modest 9.6 per cent of all editorial coverage during the period 1920-24, maintain a respectable 20.1 per cent average during the remainder of the periods under consideration (see Table I). Three sub-groups in this category command particular attention: public health, professional promotions, and

professionalism[2] (see Table IV). Editorials dealing with public health almost tripled from the period 1930-34 to 1940-44 and maintained this level of interest throughout the remaining two periods. Discussions of professional promotions, such as the newly conceived "Pharmacy Week," which took a remarkable surge during the early 1930's, decreased in importance in the eyes of the editors to a negligible 2.7 per cent by the early 1960's. Editorial comments concerning professionalism, which maintained a respectable 16.6 per cent average during the early 1920's, 1940's, and 1950's, slipped to less than 10 per cent during the other two periods. Two other sub-groups in this category deserve particular mention: interprofessional relations and the image of pharmacy and the pharmacist. Editorials concerning interprofessional relations increased during the first four periods under consideration, reaching a peak during the period 1950-54 representing 13.4 per cent of the editorials in this category. Editorial views of the public image of pharmacy and the pharmacist follows much the same pattern, reaching a peak of 12.2 per cent of

---

2. Defined as "the conduct, aims, or qualities that characterize a profession or a professional person." (Adapted from a definition in Webster's Third New International Dictionary [Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1961], p. 1811.) The essential criteria for a profession are set forth by Isador Thorner, "Pharmacy: The Functional Significance of an Institutional Pattern," Social Forces, 20: 321, March, 1942.

the editorials in this category during the period 1960-64. A few sub-groups received attention during only one period: editorials on narcotic addiction and on frauds perpetrated on pharmacists by confidence men during the period 1920-24 (62.5 and 45.8 per cent, respectively, of the total editorials in these two sub-groups), editorials on the history of pharmacy during the period 1930-34 (51.5 per cent of the total editorials in this sub-group), and editorial comments on changes in the practice of pharmacy during the period 1940-44 (48.0 per cent of the total editorials in this sub-group).

Pharmacy organizations, while capturing a respectable 11.7 per cent average of total editorial coverage, never surpassed the editorial interest recorded during the period 1920-24 (14.8 per cent), having slipped to 7.9 per cent during the World War II years of 1940-44, and finally struggling to 10.0 per cent in the early 1960's (see Table I). Closer inspection shows that nearly two-thirds of this category of editorials deal with activities of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the National Association of Retail Druggists, which is not surprising considering the journals surveyed (see Table V). However, A.Ph.A. and N.A.R.D. coverage steadily became subordinate to editorial interest in other organizations and other organizational considerations, decreasing from 71.3 per cent during the period 1920-24 to 42.9 per cent during

the early 1960's. This interest, for the most part, reflects the growth of the "one-voice-for-pharmacy" concept which, having been mentioned in passing only six times during the early 1920's, averaged 16.0 per cent during the next three periods, and finally jumped to 45.7 per cent during the early 1960's. The final item of interest in this category is the remarkable amount of editorial attention paid to state pharmaceutical associations during the early 1920's, 24.5 per cent, a position never again attained in succeeding periods.

The interaction of the profession of pharmacy with the federal government as reflected in editorial content reached its peak during the early years of World War II, accounting for 22.0 per cent of the total editorial commentary in that period. The early 1930's and the early 1960's also reflected a higher-than-average editorial interest in the relationships between pharmacy and Washington (see Table I). Looking at the data more closely, several other important trends may be noted (see Table VI). Editorials about the Great Depression constituted 79.0 per cent of the coverage in this category during the period 1930-34; such topics as civil defense, wartime shortages of quinine and first aid supplies, the machinations of the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board, the need for a U.S. Army Pharmacy Corps, and the effect of the draft on pharmacy

students and pharmacists occupied 74.3 per cent of the editorials on governmental affairs during the period 1940-44; the fear of socialized medicine prompted 28.9 per cent of the coverage in this category during the early 1950's; and government intervention and investigation of pharmacy accounted for over one-half of the editorials on government and pharmacy during the early 1960's. These four surges of editorial interest actually constitute nearly three-fifths of the total editorial comment in this category (179/303, or 59.1 per cent).

Editorial references to the pharmaceutical literature and to pharmacy journals dwindled from 82 during the early 1920's to only 19 during the early 1960's, yet remained remarkably constant on a percentage basis (see Table I). Two sub-groups within this category, references to the six journals considered in this study and references to the official compendia, account for over one-half (51.0 per cent) of the editorial topics in this category, and reflect the diminishing trend mentioned above; the editors refer less to their own journals and its articles and more to other publications and the literature; the number of editorial references to the official compendia gradually decreases during the first four periods and then plummets to a single mention during the early 1960's (see Table VII). "Seasonal" editorials, such as "Goodbye,

1922--Hello, 1923," appear with some frequency during the first two periods but assume less importance during the remainder of the periods under consideration. The passing of leaders in pharmacy during the early 1950's, however, prompted a higher-than-average number of editorial tributes (29.3 per cent), and accounts for nearly one-half of the total editorial topics in this sub-group (12/27, or 44.4 per cent).

Research, discovery, and invention related to the profession of pharmacy maintained a constant, if small, portion of the total editorial coverage in this study (see Table I). Upon closer examination, three sub-groups command particular attention; editorials on pharmaceutical research and new drugs, accounting for nearly one-half of the editorial commentary in this category (44.5 per cent); editorials on economic research, including manpower and prescription studies, accounting for another 22.8 per cent of the total; and scientific and technological research in areas outside of pharmacy, accounting for 19.7 per cent of the total in this category (see Table VIII). It is interesting to note the surges in editorial interest in pharmaceutical research during the early 1920's and early 1940's, both of which were noted for great strides in chemotherapy; the isolation of insulin during the former, the development of sulfonamides during the latter. It is also interesting to note the increase

in editorial interest in economic research during the early years of the Depression and during the early 1960's--the years of the Kefauver investigation of drug prices.

The editorial attention given to pharmaceutical education also assumed a small but relatively constant pattern over the five periods considered, with the exception of a temporary slump in interest during the early 1930's (see Table I). Closer inspection reveals that editorials concerned with the standards of pharmaceutical education occupied nearly three-quarters of the total commentary in this category, yet decreased steadily from 89.6 per cent of the editorials on pharmaceutical education during the early 1920's to 52.9 per cent of the editorials in this category during the early 1960's, reflecting, perhaps, the increasing quality of pharmaceutical education (see Table IX). Editorials calling for support--both moral and financial--for pharmaceutical education accounted for 12.2 per cent of the total editorial coverage in this category in a mixed pattern that reached its peak during the early 1960's, and editorials dealing with continuing education reflect a small but growing interest in this aspect of pharmaceutical education in the minds of the editors, increasing from 11.1 per cent of the total during the early years of World War II to 17.7 per cent of the total during the early

1960's. It is interesting to note that internship requirements received only a passing glance from the editors, for internship is mentioned only four times throughout the five periods studied.

The inevitable "other" category contains only 2.5 per cent of the total number of editorial subjects, and represents a catch-all of subject matter which did not lend itself conveniently to classification elsewhere (see Table X). Editorial reflections and nostalgic miscellany assumed a constantly diminishing role as editorials became more specific; fully two-fifths of this type of editorial appeared during the early 1920's (41.3 per cent, or 31/76) and another 22.3 per cent (or 17/76) during the early 1930's (see Table X). Except for a surge of patriotic "buy bonds" messages during the early years of World War II, this type of editorial had almost entirely disappeared by the early 1960's.

TABLE I: CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS BY PERIOD

Categories	1920-24 N	%	1930-34 N	%	1940-44 N	%	1950-54 N	%	1960-64 N	%	Total N	%
Legislation affecting pharmacy	382	39.6	136	21.7	79	15.9	137	23.3	55	15.8	789	26.1
Administrative-economic aspects	133	13.8	107	17.1	74	14.9	106	18.0	88	25.3	508	16.8
Profession and practice of pharmacy	93	9.6	114	18.2	102	20.6	119	20.2	74	21.3	502	16.6
Pharmacy organizations	143	14.8	82	13.1	39	7.9	54	9.2	35	10.0	353	11.7
Government and pharmacy	22	2.3	76	12.1	109	22.0	52	8.8	44	12.6	303	10.0
Pharmaceutical literature	82	8.5	55	8.8	46	9.3	41	7.0	19	5.5	243	8.0
Research, discovery, and invention	41	4.3	31	4.9	15	3.0	27	4.6	13	3.7	127	4.2
Pharmaceutical education	38	3.9	9	1.4	27	5.4	32	5.5	17	4.9	123	4.1
Other	31	3.2	17	2.7	5	1.0	20	3.4	3	0.9	76	2.5
TOTAL SUBJECTS	965	100.0	627	100.0	496	100.0	588	100.0	348	100.0	3024	100.0
TOTAL EDITORIALS	281		253		315		292		274		1415	
RATIO OF SUBJECTS TO EDITORIALS	3.4		2.3		1.6		2.0		1.3		2.1	

TABLE II: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Prohibition	213	55.8	20	14.7	1	1.3	-	-	-	-	234	29.7
Narcotic licenses and control	36	9.4	12	8.8	5	6.3	6	4.4	1	1.8	60	7.6
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	3	0.9	1	0.7	7	8.9	4	2.9	4	7.3	19	2.4
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	7	1.8	19	14.0	14	17.7	29	21.2	11	20.0	80	10.1
Fair trade; price maintenance and control	12	3.1	54	39.7	27	34.2	53	38.7	6	10.9	152	19.3
State legislation	13	3.4	3	2.2	6	7.6	4	2.9	1	1.8	27	3.4
State boards; registration; reciprocity	13	3.4	2	1.6	1	1.3	8	5.8	3	5.5	27	3.4
Taxation	41	10.7	18	13.2	10	12.6	11	8.0	1	1.8	81	10.3
Court decisions	15	3.9	3	2.2	2	2.5	19	13.9	26	47.3	65	8.2
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	9	2.4	3	2.2	3	3.8	2	1.5	1	1.8	18	2.3
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	20	5.2	1	0.7	3	3.8	1	0.7	1	1.8	26	3.3
TOTAL	382	100.0	136	100.0	79	100.0	137	100.0	55	100.0	789	100.0

TABLE III: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business	29	21.8	14	13.1	19	25.6	17	16.0	5	5.7	84	16.5
Marketing	12	9.0	8	7.5	4	5.4	9	8.5	5	5.7	38	7.5
Merchandising	48	36.1	20	18.7	24	32.4	36	34.0	29	32.9	157	30.9
Advertising, promotions	16	12.0	17	15.9	2	2.7	23	21.7	16	18.2	74	14.6
Competition	11	8.3	23	21.5	15	20.3	9	8.5	11	12.5	69	13.6
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	2	1.5	4	3.7	1	1.3	11	10.4	7	8.0	25	4.9
Hours and wages	4	3.0	2	1.9	6	8.1	-	-	1	1.1	13	2.4
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	11	8.3	18	16.8	2	2.7	-	-	12	13.6	43	8.5
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	-	1	0.9	1	1.3	1	1.1	2	2.3	5	1.0
TOTAL	133	100.0	107	100.0	74	100.0	106	100.0	88	100.0	508	100.0

TABLE IV: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interprofessional relations	5	5.4	5	4.4	13	12.7	16	13.4	8	10.8	47	9.4
Professional problems	1	1.1	-	-	-	-	2	1.7	3	4.1	6	1.2
"Professionalism"	16	17.2	11	9.7	17	16.6	19	16.0	7	9.5	70	13.8
Ethics; codes and oaths	1	1.1	1	0.9	1	1.0	5	4.2	3	4.1	11	2.2
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	10	10.8	6	5.3	7	6.9	10	8.4	9	12.2	42	8.4
Pharmacy in the lay press	4	4.3	2	1.7	3	2.9	2	1.7	-	-	11	2.2
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	8	8.6	40	35.1	18	17.6	6	5.0	2	2.7	74	14.7
Other professions	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.7	-	-	2	0.4
Public health	8	8.6	9	7.9	22	21.6	23	19.3	15	20.0	77	15.3
Narcotic addiction	15	16.1	4	3.5	-	-	5	4.2	-	-	24	4.8
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.7	9	12.2	11	2.2

TABLE IV - Cont.

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	5	5.4	6	5.3	-	-	3	2.5	-	-	14	2.8
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	11	11.8	2	1.7	1	1.0	7	5.9	3	4.1	24	4.8
History of pharmacy	7	7.5	17	14.9	2	2.0	5	4.2	2	2.7	33	6.6
Women in pharmacy	-	-	-	-	4	3.9	-	-	-	-	4	0.8
Hospital pharmacy	2	2.1	3	2.6	2	2.0	1	0.8	2	2.7	10	2.0
Pharmaceutical industry	-	-	2	1.7	-	-	9	7.6	6	8.1	17	3.4
Changes in practice	-	-	6	5.3	12	11.8	2	1.7	5	6.8	25	5.0
TOTAL	93	100.0	114	100.0	102	100.0	119	100.0	74	100.0	502	100.0

TABLE V: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Support your; affiliations; one voice for pharmacy	6	4.2	13	15.9	6	15.4	9	16.7	16	45.7	50	14.2
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	102	71.7	58	70.7	24	61.5	32	59.3	15	42.9	231	65.4
Other national or state organizations	35	24.5	9	11.0	8	20.5	8	14.8	3	8.6	63	17.8
International organizations	-	-	2	2.4	1	2.6	5	9.2	1	2.8	9	2.6
TOTAL	143	100.0	82	100.0	39	100.0	54	100.0	35	100.0	353	100.0

TABLE VI: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	6	27.3	2	2.6	9	8.3	6	11.5	23	52.3	46	15.2
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	2	9.1	3	4.0	8	7.3	15	28.8	9	20.4	37	12.2
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	7	9.3	-	-	2	3.8	-	-	9	3.0
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	-	-	59	54.1	9	17.3	2	4.5	70	23.1
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	-	2	2.6	22	20.2	-	-	-	-	24	7.9
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	7	31.8	2	2.6	3	2.8	8	15.4	5	11.4	25	8.3
Communism; Socialism	-	-	-	-	1	0.9	3	5.9	-	-	4	1.3
National economy (general)	1	4.5	-	-	-	-	2	3.8	1	2.3	4	1.3
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.	6	27.3	60	78.9	7	6.4	7	13.5	4	9.1	84	27.7
TOTAL	22	100.0	76	100.0	109	100.0	52	100.0	44	100.0	303	100.0

TABLE VII: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
This journal; reference to article	34	41.5	15	27.3	13	28.2	1	2.4	3	15.8	66	27.3
Editor; editorial policy	1	1.2	3	5.4	4	8.7	-	-	1	5.3	9	3.7
Other journals; literature; publications	3	3.6	2	3.6	1	2.2	5	12.2	4	21.0	15	6.2
Official compendia	16	19.5	15	27.3	14	30.4	12	29.3	1	5.3	58	23.9
Editorial tributes	6	7.3	4	7.3	1	2.2	12	29.3	4	21.0	27	11.1
Pharmacy personalities	9	11.0	4	7.3	5	10.9	9	22.0	2	10.6	29	11.9
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	1	2.2	1	2.4	-	-	2	0.7
Seasonal	13	15.9	12	21.8	7	15.2	1	2.4	4	21.0	37	15.2
TOTAL	82	100.0	55	100.0	46	100.0	41	100.0	19	100.0	243	100.0

TABLE VIII: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	23	56.1	10	32.3	11	73.3	10	37.0	3	23.1	57	44.9
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	13	31.7	8	25.8	2	13.3	2	7.5	-	-	25	19.7
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	-	13	11.9	2	13.3	8	29.6	6	46.2	29	22.8
Awards, honors, prizes	5	12.2	-	-	-	-	7	25.9	4	30.7	16	12.6
TOTAL	41	100.0	31	100.0	15	100.0	27	100.0	13	100.0	127	100.0

TABLE IX: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24		1930-34		1940-44		1950-54		1960-64		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Standards of education	34	89.6	6	66.7	19	70.4	24	75.0	9	52.9	92	74.8
Support for education; valedictory	2	5.2	1	11.1	5	18.5	2	6.2	5	29.4	15	12.2
Internship; preceptors	2	5.2	-	-	-	-	2	6.3	-	-	4	3.2
Continuing education	-	-	2	22.2	3	11.1	4	12.5	3	17.7	12	9.8
TOTAL	38	100.0	9	100.0	27	100.0	32	100.0	17	100.0	123	100.0

TABLE X: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	1920-24 N	%	1930-34 N	%	1940-44 N	%	1950-54 N	%	1960-64 N	%	Total N	%
Miscellaneous; miscellany	8	25.8	6	35.3	2	40.0	7	35.0	-	-	23	30.3
Nostalgia, reflections	1	3.3	1	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.6
Virtues	13	41.9	6	35.3	1	20.0	1	5.0	-	-	21	27.6
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	9	29.0	4	23.5	2	40.0	12	60.0	3	100.0	30	39.5
TOTAL	31	100.0	17	100.0	5	100.0	20	100.0	3	100.0	76	100.0

CHAPTER V

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT CATEGORIES BY JOURNAL

With some understanding of the general trends apparent in editorial subjects within each of the five five-year periods selected for this study, as drawn from the combined data of the six pharmaceutical journals chosen for analysis, we may now consider the trends in editorial subjects which appear within each journal, as drawn from the combined data of the five periods considered, following the conventions of Chapter IV.

The total column ranking the subject categories by their editorial popularity, of course, does not change; however, there are marked changes among the journals in this regard. Rank order correlations between the percentages in the total column and the individual journal columns reveal the following information:

Journal	Rank Order Correlation
N.A.R.D. Journal	.90
American Druggist	.88
Drug Topics	.85
American Professional Pharmacist	.85
Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association	.38
American Journal of Pharmacy	.12

Sampling random samples from the same sampling population will average approximately the same results, within a specific frame of reference. This would imply that a content analysis of a similar random sample of editorials appearing in the N.A.R.D. Journal and the American Druggist during the period 1920 through 1964 would give one a good idea of what was discussed in all six journals considered in this study during the same period. This would also imply that the editors of the American Journal of Pharmacy and the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association during this same period did not reflect the interests of their fellow editors working on other journals.

In Chapter IV we mentioned the decrease in the number of subjects discussed per editorial--a drop from 3.4 during the period 1920-24 to 1.3 during 1960-64. We may now describe how each of the six journals contributed to this decrease (see Table XI). The American Professional Pharmacist discussed an average of 3.0 subjects per editorial. The N.A.R.D. Journal and the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association followed with 2.4 and 2.3 subjects per editorial, respectively, slightly above the average of 2.1. Both the American Druggist and Drug Topics were below average in this respect with a mean of 1.8 subjects per editorial, the American Journal of

Pharmacy trailing with only 1.2 subjects being discussed per editorial.

Closer examination of the data reveals that the American Journal of Pharmacy devoted almost one-third (32.2 per cent) of its total editorial coverage to the profession and practice of pharmacy, nearly twice the average of the six journals combined, and another 13.6 per cent to research, discovery, and invention in pharmacy, over three times the combined average of 4.2 per cent. However, editorials dealing with administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy accounted for only 2.8 per cent of the total editorial subjects drawn from the Journal, one-sixth of the combined average of 16.8 per cent.

The American Professional Pharmacist also devoted a considerable amount of editorial space (44.0 per cent) to the profession and practice of pharmacy and to legislation, but, interestingly enough, also devoted another 16.6 per cent to the administrative and economic aspects of the profession. All but 15 of the 107 editorials in this category (14.0 per cent), however, appeared in The Practical Druggist, the journalistic precursor of the American Professional Pharmacist (see Table XXXIV, Appendix B). This finding casts some doubt on Holland's insistence that publisher Pierson had purged all "commercial and merchandising articles" from the pages

of his publication.[1] Contrary to what might be expected from a journal of its mien, the American Professional Pharmacist relegated the problems of pharmaceutical education to a minor editorial role, devoting only 3.9 per cent of its attention to the subject, slightly below the average of 4.1 per cent for the six journals combined.

The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association may be characterized by the editorial attention paid to both the profession and practice of pharmacy and, naturally enough, to pharmacy organizations, both categories constituting almost one-half (48.0 per cent) of the Journal's total editorial comment. Editorial references to the pharmaceutical literature occupied a surprising 13.8 per cent of the Journal's total editorials, but references to administrative and economic matters were almost entirely neglected, accounting for only 2.3 per cent of this total, which is less than one-sixth the combined coverage for the six journals analyzed.

The National Association of Retail Druggists is noted for the careful attention it pays to the legislative processes in Washington. This is substantiated by the

---

1. Madeline Oxford Holland, "The Development of a Pharmaceutical Journal--the American Professional Pharmacist" (presented at the third joint session of the American Institute of the History of Pharmacy and the American Pharmaceutical Association Section on Historical Pharmacy [at the Invitation of the A.I.H.P.], Salt Lake City, Utah, August 21, 1953), p. 2. (Typescript in Kremers Files.)

fact that during the five periods encompassed by this study, the N.A.R.D. Journal devoted three-eighths (37.5 per cent) of its editorial columns to legislation affecting pharmacy, a substantially higher percentage than any of the other five journals analyzed. In contrast to the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, however, the N.A.R.D. Journal devoted much less editorial attention to the profession and practice of pharmacy and to pharmaceutical organizations, both categories constituting 29.9 per cent of the Journal's total editorial coverage. Administrative and economic aspects of the profession garnered 13.7 per cent of this total. Pharmaceutical education, as seen through the eyes of the N.A.R.D. Journal editors was relegated to a position of minor importance, accounting for less than 1.0 per cent of their total editorial comment.

The American Druggist, which rated high on total editorial subject correlation, devoted almost one-half (46.3 per cent) of its editorial space to the two most-discussed analysis categories--legislation affecting pharmacy and the administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy. A surprising 14.1 per cent of the American Druggist's total editorial coverage was concerned with the pharmaceutical literature, nearly twice the average of the six journals combined, whereas commentary on the

profession and practice of pharmacy constituted only 13.3 per cent of this total, slightly less than the combined average of 16.6 per cent.

Drug Topics may be characterized as being more concerned with the administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy than any of the other five journals analyzed, for during the five five-year periods considered, for it devoted almost one-third (32.8 per cent) of its editorial coverage to this category. This percentage is almost twice the average of the six journals combined (16.8 per cent). Legislation dealing with pharmacy also ranked high in Drug Topics' editorial mix, and together these two categories account for over one-half (56.5 per cent) of its total editorial coverage. Discussions of pharmacy and government also assumed a greater role in Drug Topics' editorials than in any of the other five journals considered (13.7 per cent). Editorial dealing with the profession and practice of pharmacy accounted for 10.7 per cent of Drug Topics' total editorial coverage, ranking as the fourth most-discussed category in this journal.

We may now consider the tables which deal with the nine categories of analysis by journal in detail. Table XII shows the editorial coverage given to specific types of legislation by journal. The coverage of prohibition during the early 1920's occupied a major portion of the

editorials dealing with legislation in all journals except the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and Drug Topics, in which it received only passing comment (see Tables XXI through XXVI, Appendix B).[2] The American Journal of Pharmacy devoted over one-third of its editorial commentary on legislation to federal laws affecting pharmacy, especially during the early 1930's (see Table XXI). The American Professional Pharmacist devoted 35.3 per cent of its total legislative coverage to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, machinations of the Food and Drug Administration, fair trade and price maintenance legislation, and taxation, but it should be noted that all but 13 of the 153 editorials dealing with legislation appeared in The Practical Druggist during the early 1920's and early 1930's (see Table XXII).

The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, apparently seeing Durham-Humphrey-type legislation as an encroachment on the pharmacist's traditional prerogative to refill prescription-legend medication at his professional discretion, devoted 12 of its 17 editorials dealing with legislation to this problem during the early

---

2. Appendix B contains Tables XXI through LXXIV, which pinpoint editorial coverage in each category of analysis by period for each of the six journals considered, and will be referred to throughout the remainder of this chapter.

1950's (see Table XXIII). The Journal also paid considerable editorial attention to court decisions affecting pharmacy, which accounted for 15.2 per cent of its editorials on legislation. Both the American Druggist and Drug Topics also devoted nearly twice the average editorial coverage for this topic, but the three remaining journals paid little editorial attention to court decisions, and the American Journal of Pharmacy did not mention them at all.

The N.A.R.D. Journal has been characterized as the staunch defender of fair trade and the steadfast opponent of discriminatory--or any other--taxation. This is reflected in the editorial coverage given to these two topics, which comprised 35.7 per cent of the total number of editorials dealing with legislation in this journal. One is hard-pressed, however, to explain why 11.3 per cent of the N.A.R.D. Journal's editorials dealing with legislation, especially during the early 1920's, were devoted to reminding pharmacists that their narcotic licenses were due for renewal (see Table XXIV). This preoccupation with narcotic renewal dates perhaps reflects an early problem of compliance with the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914, although this possibility is not specifically mentioned in the editorials cited.

The American Druggist was particularly remarkable for its editorial coverage of state board regulations, registration, and reciprocity during the early 1920's (see Table XXV). This coverage, comprising 11.2 per cent of the American Druggist's editorials on legislation, was greater than any other journal considered in this study. The American Druggist's editors also paid due regard to the fight for fair trade legislation, which accounted for 14.6 per cent of their commentary in this category. The extraordinary amount of editorial discussion in American Druggist on court decisions affecting pharmacy, particularly during the early 1920's and the early 1960's, has already been mentioned, and accounted for another 16.8 per cent of the total number of editorials concerning legislation in this journal.

The editors of Drug Topics also paid considerable attention to court decisions affecting pharmacy, as has been stated, and devoted 14.3 per cent of their total commentary on legislation to this topic, particularly during the period 1950-54 (see Table XXVI). One-half of all the editorials dealing with fair trade also appeared during this period, and the total percentage of editorial coverage of this topic by Drug Topics surpassed that of all other journals analyzed. Editorials concerning Durham-Humphrey-type legislation, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Food and Drug Administration

constituted 12.0 per cent of Drug Topics' total editorial coverage of this category.

The administrative and economic aspect of the profession of pharmacy during the five five-year periods considered in this study were handled for the most part by four journals: The Practical Druggist, the N.A.R.D. Journal, the American Druggist, and Drug Topics. These journals accounted for all but 13 of the 508 editorials dealing with this category (97.4 per cent; see Table XIII). A general pattern of devoting about three-fourths of such editorial coverage to the four categories of business, merchandising, competition, and advertising and promotions is reflected by The Practical Druggist (82.2 per cent) and Drug Topics (86.4 per cent) and to a lesser extent by the N.A.R.D. Journal (64.3 per cent) and the American Druggist (69.3 per cent), the latter two journals devoting proportionally more space to the marketing aspects of pharmacy. The relative emphasis placed by each journal on these four topics reveals their particular editorial thrust on administrative and economic aspects of pharmacy, The Practical Druggist emphasizing advertising and promotions, the N.A.R.D. Journal stressing business matters, and the American Druggist and Drug Topics both emphasizing merchandising. The American Journal of Pharmacy and the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association neglected this particular

aspect of pharmacy almost entirely, condescending to mention such things only 5 and 8 times, respectively, during the five five-year periods analyzed.

The problems caused by price cutting and fixing during the early 1930's affected pharmacists throughout the United States. Many of these problems were aired in the editorial columns of the N.A.R.D. Journal during this period and, indeed, the total editorial coverage of this topic was greater in the N.A.R.D. Journal than in any of the other five journals analyzed (17.8 per cent). The mail-order prescription schemes of the early 1960's were also mentioned in the editorial pages of the N.A.R.D. Journal and the American Druggist to a greater extent than in any of the other journals surveyed (see Tables XXVII through XXXII, especially Tables XXX and XXXI).

Analysis of the editorial space devoted to discussion of the profession and practice of pharmacy reveals an interesting split (see Table XI). The American Journal of Pharmacy, the American Professional Pharmacist, and the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association all devoted an average of 25.7 per cent of their total editorial coverage to topics within this category, whereas less than one-half as much attention (average = 12.3 per cent) was given to the same topics by the N.A.R.D. Journal, the American Druggist, and Drug Topics. Within this split, however, the journals displayed their characteristic

scopes of interest (see Table XIV). The American Journal of Pharmacy concentrated 56.1 per cent of its editorial coverage of the profession and practice of pharmacy on only three topics: professionalism and the history of pharmacy during the early 1920's and early 1930's, and editorials dealing with public health during the early 1930's and early 1940's (see Table XXXIII). About two-thirds (65.3 per cent) of the editorial coverage devoted to this category by the American Professional Pharmacist was spread over five topics: interprofessional relations, professionalism, the image of the pharmacy and of pharmacy, professional promotions, and public health, the latter receiving the greatest emphasis (17.7 per cent), especially during the early 1950's. Editorials dealing with professional promotions were stressed during the early 1930's and early 1940's, while the importance of interprofessional relations and professionalism was emphasized by the editors during the early 1940's and early 1950's. The professional image of pharmacy and the pharmacist was stressed in The Practical Druggist and the American Professional Pharmacist throughout the five five-year periods analyzed (see Table XXXIV).

The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association assumed much the same pattern as the American Professional Pharmacist, the editors devoting over three-fourths (76.6 per cent) of their commentary in this category to the same five topics. Editorials dealing

with public health again received the greatest emphasis (23.3 per cent), this interest being manifested during all five periods analyzed. Professionalism, interprofessional relations, and professional promotions all assumed equal importance (15.1 per cent) in the eyes of the editors of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, professionalism being stressed during the early 1930's, interprofessional relations during the early 1940's, and professional promotions throughout the last four periods studied. Somewhat less editorial importance was assigned to the professional image of pharmacy and of the pharmacist (8.1 per cent), however, this topic appeared in four of the five periods considered. Finally, it is interesting to note in passing that the nine editorial excursions into the history of pharmacy by the Journal which were recorded occurred during the period 1930-34, and coincides nicely with the founding of the American Institute of Pharmacy and the establishment of its historical archives (see Table XXXV).

The editorial efforts of the remaining three journals on behalf of the profession and practice of pharmacy were concentrated heavily on only one or two topics. The N.A.R.D. Journal stressed professional promotions during the first three periods, especially during the early 1930's, this topic accounting for 27.0 per cent of the

Journal's editorials in this category (see Table XXXVI). The American Druggist emphasized professionalism throughout all five periods particularly during the early 1920's, this subject constituting 27.7 per cent of its editorial mix within this category (see Table XXXVII). Public health dominated editorial discussions of the profession and practice of pharmacy in Drug Topics during the last three periods studied and especially during the early 1950's, this topic accounting for 28.4 per cent of all editorials in this category (see Table XXXVIII). It should be noted that the editorial coverage of each of these topics in their respective journals was nearly twice the average for the six journals combined.

Secondary importance was given to interprofessional relations in the editorial columns of the N.A.R.D. Journal, particularly during the early 1950's, and to the image of pharmacy and professional promotions in the American Druggist, editorials on the latter appearing only during the period 1930-34. Professionalism and professional promotions were also featured in the editorial columns of Drug Topics, the former during the early 1950's and early 1960's, the latter during the middle three periods of analysis. It is important to note that only these latter two journals paid any significant attention to changes within the practice of pharmacy, editorials on this topic constituting 10.6 per

cent and 15.0 per cent, respectively, of the totals of their editorials in this category.

As one might expect, association journals like the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the N.A.R.D. Journal devote significantly more editorial space to discussing their own activities and problems than other types of pharmaceutical journals do. During the five five-year periods analyzed, the former journal devoted 23.3 per cent of its total editorial space to such coverage, the latter, 16.9 per cent, both journals ranking editorials about their own and other pharmacy organizations second in the list of categories of analysis by journal. In contrast, the other four journals analyzed gave an average of 6.5 per cent of their total editorials over to pharmacy organizations (see Table XI).

This trend is underscored in Table XV. The editors of both the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the N.A.R.D. Journal devoted over three-fourths of their editorials in this category to discussing their own organizations, the former spreading such coverage over all five periods of analysis, the latter concentrating upon the early 1920's and early 1930's (see Tables XLI and XLII). The editors of the American Professional Pharmacist, the American Druggist,

and Drug Topics were somewhat more cosmopolitan in their editorial coverage of pharmacy organizations, however Drug Topics actually devoted over one-half (55.2 per cent) of its editorials in this category to the activities of the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D. The American Journal of Pharmacy mentioned pharmacy organizations only 8 times during the five five-year periods analyzed, but it is interesting to note that 5 of the 8 editorials urged support for organization, affiliation, and the "one-voice-for-pharmacy" movement (see Table XXXIX). These topics also received support in the editorial pages of the American Professional Pharmacist, particularly during the early 1950's (see Table XL), and in the American Druggist, which devoted 32.4 per cent of its editorial coverage of pharmacy organizations to these topics. Finally, it should be noted that international pharmacy organizations, such as the International Pharmaceutical Federation, were mentioned editorially by only two journals, particularly during the early 1950's; the American Professional Pharmacist and the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (see also Tables XLIII and XLIV).

The category of pharmacy and government received almost equal attention from all six journals analyzed, averaging 10.0 per cent of their total editorial coverage (see Table XI). However, individual journals concentrated

their efforts to various facets of this general subject (see Table XVI). The American Journal of Pharmacy devoted four-fifths (80.0 per cent) of its coverage of governmental affairs to the intervention in and the investigation of pharmacy, the fear of socialized medicine, and the role of the pharmacist in the war effort, all in equal proportions (see Table XLV). The American Professional Pharmacist gave 52.5 per cent of its editorial coverage in this category to the war effort and to the national economy, yet did not neglect governmental intervention and investigation of pharmacy, socialized medicine, and the draft, these latter three items averaging 14.7 per cent of the Journal's governmental comment (see Table XLVI).

The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association devoted over one-half (52.3 per cent) of its editorial on government to the war effort and to the role of the pharmacist in government, giving secondary emphasis to specific national economic problems (14.3 per cent) and to the problems of the pharmacist and the draft (11.4 per cent) (see Table XLVII). The editors of the N.A.R.D. Journal also concentrated heavily on specific economic problems, particularly during the early 1930's, this topic accounting for 35.7 per cent of their editorial coverage in this category. The editors devoted much of the balance of their editorial commentary (45.2 per cent) on affairs in Washington, especially during the early 1960's,

discussing governmental intervention and investigation of pharmacy and socialized medicine, as well as urging support for legislation favorable to the profession of pharmacy. The latter area, traditionally one of N.A.R.D.'s strong guns, rated more than twice the average coverage for the other five journals analyzed (see Table XLVIII).

The editors of the American Druggist and Drug Topics concentrated their editorial coverage of governmental affairs on three areas: governmental intervention and investigation of pharmacy, the role of the pharmacist in the war effort, and specific national economic problems, but whereas the American Druggist emphasized the national economy, Drug Topics stressed the war effort (see Tables XLIX and L). The latter two areas received more attention from these journals than from any of the other four journals analyzed.

Only the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the American Druggist devoted a significant portion of their total editorial coverage (average = 14.0 per cent) to discussing the pharmaceutical literature, causing this category to be ranked third in the list of categories of analysis by journal (see Table XI). The remaining four journals averaged less than one-half as much editorial coverage for this category (6.7 per cent). Closer inspection of the data (see Table XVII) reveals

that over one-half of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association's editorials devoted to literature were concerned with the official compendia, especially during the early 1930's (see Table LIII). Another 14.6 per cent was devoted to editorial tributes to famous personages in pharmacy. This is remarkably similar to the American Journal of Pharmacy's editorial coverage of the same two topics, 53.4 per cent and 20.0 per cent, respectively, although it represents less than one-third the number of editorials (see Table LI).

The American Druggist, however, devoted over one-half (56.0 per cent) of its editorials in this category to discussing itself and its own articles, particularly during the early 1920's (see Table LV). This was not a novel conceit on the part of the American Druggist, which was joined in this endeavor during the first three periods of analysis by the American Professional Pharmacist (see Table LII) and, to some extent, by the N.A.R.D. Journal (see Table LIV). The latter three journals--as well as the American Journal of Pharmacy--all exhibited the penchant toward seasonal editorials lauding Thanksgiving, Christmas, and the new year, actually devoting an average of 17.4 per cent of their editorial coverage in this category to this festive predeliction. The N.A.R.D. Journal devoted 21.2 per cent of its editorials on literature to editorial tributes and another 17.3 per

cent to personalities in pharmacy, particularly during the early 1920's. Similarly, fully 37.5 per cent of Drug Topics' editorials on literature were devoted to these personalities. The editors of Drug Topics also devoted 12.5 per cent of their commentary in this category to other journals and publications, which exceeded that in the other five journals analyzed (see Table LVI).

Research, discovery, and invention in pharmacy assumed importance in the editorial columns of only one journal, the American Journal of Pharmacy, which devoted 13.6 per cent of its total editorial coverage to this topic. Casual mentions of research were made by the American Professional Pharmacist (7.8 per cent) and the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (6.3 per cent), but the remaining three journals averaged only about 1.9 per cent in this respect (see Table XI). A definite split is seen between the first three journals and the latter three, however, on the basis of what type of research was mentioned (see Table XVIII). The American Journal of Pharmacy devoted 83.3 per cent of its editorials on research to pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical research, particularly during the first three periods of analysis (see Table LVII). The American Professional Pharmacist followed the same pattern, devoting 70.0 per cent of its coverage to these two topics (see Table LVIII). The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association

devoted 68.2 per cent of its editorials on research to the pharmaceutical variety, particularly during the early 1920's, the other areas of scientific endeavor rating only one mention during the period 1950-54 (see Table LIX).

Results of economic research were mentioned in the editorial columns of the American Professional Pharmacist at least three times as often as any other journal surveyed, especially during the early 1930's and early 1950's. The N.A.R.D. Journal and the American Druggist also dwelt on economic, manpower, and prescription research, this area accounting for 41.7 per cent and 36.4 per cent, respectively, of their editorial commentary on research (see Tables LX and LXI). Scientific honors and tributes were mentioned several times by all journals considered in this study except the American Professional Pharmacist. The small number of editorials dealing with research drawn for Drug Topics is suggestive of the importance given to this topic by its editors, but precluded further analysis (see Table LXII).

The American Journal of Pharmacy may also be characterized as being a staunch advocate of pharmaceutical education, and devoted 9.0 per cent of its total editorial space to the topic, followed closely by the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (8.6 per cent). About one-half of this level of interest in education (average =

4.8 per cent) was exhibited by the American Professional Pharmacist, the American Druggist, and Drug Topics, while the N.A.R.D. Journal mentioned the subject only 6 times throughout the five five-year periods under consideration (see Table XI).

Standards of pharmaceutical education and garnering support for it occupied the vast majority of editorials on education (see Table XIX). Discussions of standards captured the most attention, however, accounting for an average of 90.3 per cent of the editorial comment in this sub-group in three journals: the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Journal of Pharmacy, and the American Druggist. The editors of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association were particularly concerned with standards of pharmaceutical education during the early 1920's and early 1950's (see Table LXV). Their contemporaries at the American Druggist shared this concern, but only during the early 1920's (see Table LXVII). Standards of pharmaceutical education were discussed editorially in the pages of the American Journal of Pharmacy throughout the five periods analyzed, but this coverage reached a peak during the early 1940's (see Table LXIII).

Pharmacy internship and pharmacy preceptors are mentioned in only three journals: the American Journal of Pharmacy, the American Professional Pharmacist and the

American Druggist, but only during the early 1920's and the early 1950's, and only in passing (see Tables LXIII, LXIV, and LXVII). Continuing education is mentioned in only two journals: the American Journal of Pharmacy and Drug Topics, gaining some momentum during the last two periods analyzed (see Tables LXIII and LXVIII). The latter journal has also been notable for its valedictory editorials welcoming graduating pharmacy classes into the profession.

Table XX shows a detailed breakdown of "other" editorials by journal. Due to the small numbers involved and the types of material discussed, we need not dwell on these editorials, which have been tabulated for data consistency (see also Tables LXIX through LXXIV). It might be mentioned in passing, however, that the virtues discussed in these editorials were real ones--truth, honesty, fair play, reliability, thriftiness, and--especially during the early 1920's--formed the basis for editorial sermonettes and, we suspect, fillers.

TABLE XI: CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS BY JOURNAL

CATEGORIES	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Legislation affecting pharmacy	28	15.8	153	23.8	33	9.5	353	37.5	89	25.1	133	23.7	789	26.1
Administrative-economic aspects	5	2.8	107	16.6	8	2.3	129	13.7	75	21.2	184	32.8	508	16.8
Profession and practice of pharmacy	57	32.2	130	20.2	86	24.7	122	13.0	47	13.3	60	10.7	502	16.6
Pharmacy organizations	8	4.5	42	6.5	81	23.3	159	16.9	34	9.6	29	5.2	353	11.7
Government and pharmacy	15	8.5	59	9.2	35	10.1	95	10.1	22	6.2	77	13.7	303	10.0
Pharmaceutical literature	15	8.5	46	7.2	48	13.8	52	5.5	50	14.1	32	5.7	243	8.0
Research, discovery, and invention	24	13.6	50	7.8	22	6.3	12	1.3	11	3.1	8	1.4	127	4.2
Pharmaceutical education	16	9.0	25	3.9	29	8.3	6	0.6	20	5.7	27	4.8	123	4.1
Other	9	5.1	31	4.8	6	1.7	13	1.4	6	1.7	11	2.0	76	2.5

TABLE XI - Cont.

CATEGORIES	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL SUBJECTS	177	100.0	643	100.0	348	100.0	941	100.0	354	100.0	561	100.0	3024	100.0
TOTAL EDITORIALS	147		215		150		395		198		310		1415	
RATIO OF SUBJECTS TO EDITORIALS	1.2		3.0		2.3		2.4		1.8		1.8		2.1	

TABLE XII: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Prohibition	11	39.2	64	41.8	2	6.1	118	33.4	32	36.0	37	5.3	234	29.7
Narcotic licenses and control	-	-	7	4.6	3	9.1	40	11.3	1	1.1	9	6.8	60	7.6
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	1	3.6	1	0.7	-	-	13	3.7	-	-	4	3.0	19	2.4
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	10	35.7	21	13.7	17	51.5	12	3.4	4	4.5	16	12.0	80	10.1
Fair trade; price maintenance and control	-	-	16	10.5	2	6.1	79	22.4	13	14.6	42	31.6	152	19.3
State legislation	1	3.6	4	2.6	1	3.0	8	2.3	3	3.4	10	7.5	27	3.4
State boards; registration; reciprocity	1	3.6	4	2.6	1	3.0	3	0.9	10	11.2	8	6.0	27	3.4
Taxation	-	-	17	11.1	1	3.0	47	13.3	5	5.6	11	8.3	81	10.3
Court decisions	-	-	8	5.2	5	15.2	18	5.1	15	16.8	19	14.3	65	8.2

TABLE XII - Cont.

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm. N	Am. J. Pharm. %	Am. Prof. Pharm. N	Am. Prof. Pharm. %	A.Ph.A. J. N	A.Ph.A. J. %	N.A.R.D. J. N	N.A.R.D. J. %	American Druggist N	American Druggist %	Drug Topics N	Drug Topics %	Total N	Total %
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	-	-	7	4.6	-	-	4	1.1	3	3.4	4	3.0	18	2.3
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	4	14.3	4	2.6	1	3.0	11	3.1	3	3.4	3	2.3	26	3.3
TOTAL	28	100.0	153	100.0	33	100.0	353	100.0	89	100.0	133	100.0	789	100.0

TABLE XIII: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business	-	-	17	15.9	1	12.5	37	28.7	9	12.0	20	10.9	84	16.5
Marketing	1	20.0	5	4.7	1	12.5	14	10.9	8	10.7	9	4.9	38	7.5
Merchandising	-	-	24	22.4	1	12.5	27	20.9	26	34.7	79	42.9	157	30.9
Advertising, promotions	-	-	32	29.9	-	-	3	2.3	4	5.3	35	19.0	74	14.6
Competition	-	-	15	14.0	-	-	16	12.4	13	17.3	25	13.6	69	13.6
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	2	40.0	7	6.5	3	37.5	4	3.1	5	6.7	4	2.2	25	4.9
Hours and wages	-	-	2	1.9	-	-	4	3.1	2	2.7	5	2.7	13	2.4
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	-	-	5	4.7	1	12.5	23	17.8	7	4.3	7	3.8	43	8.5

TABLE XIII - Cont.

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	2	20.0	-	-	1	12.5	1	0.8	1	1.3	-	-	5	1.0
TOTAL	5	100.0	107	100.0	8	100.0	129	100.0	75	100.0	184	100.0	508	100.0

TABLE XIV: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interprofessional relations	2	3.5	15	11.5	13	15.1	13	10.7	2	4.3	2	3.3	47	9.4
Professional problems	3	5.4	1	0.8	-	-	1	0.8	1	2.1	-	-	6	1.2
"Professionalism"	10	17.5	18	13.8	13	15.1	10	8.2	10	27.7	13	10.0	70	13.8
Ethics; codes and oaths	-	-	4	3.1	2	2.3	1	0.8	-	-	4	6.7	11	2.2
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	1	1.7	14	10.8	7	8.1	9	7.4	9	19.1	2	3.3	42	8.4
Pharmacy in the lay press	1	1.7	1	0.8	-	-	8	6.6	1	2.1	-	-	11	2.2
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	1	1.7	15	11.5	13	15.1	33	27.0	5	10.6	7	11.7	74	14.7
Other professions	-	-	1	0.8	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.4
Public health	10	17.5	23	17.7	20	23.3	5	4.1	2	4.3	17	28.4	77	15.3

TABLE XIV - Cont.

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm. N	%	Am. Prof. Pharm. N	%	A.Ph.A. J. N	%	N.A.R.D. J. N	%	American Druggist N	%	Drug Topics N	%	Total N	%
Narcotic addiction	2	3.5	7	5.4	5	5.8	6	4.9	2	4.3	2	3.3	24	4.8
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	4	7.0	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	3	6.4	1	1.7	11	2.2
Crimes, fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	5	8.8	8	6.2	-	-	6	4.9	2	4.3	3	5.0	24	4.8
History of pharmacy	12	21.1	5	3.8	9	10.5	6	4.9	1	2.1	-	-	33	6.6
Women in pharmacy	1	1.7	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0.8
Hospital pharmacy	2	3.5	4	3.1	3	3.5	-	-	1	2.1	-	-	10	2.0
Pharmaceutical industry	-	-	1	0.8	-	-	11	9.0	-	-	5	8.3	17	3.4
Changes in practice	3	5.4	5	3.8	-	-	3	2.5	5	10.6	9	15.0	25	5.0
TOTAL	57	100.0	130	100.0	86	100.0	122	100.0	47	100.0	60	100.0	502	100.0

TABLE XV: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Support your; affiliation; one voice for pharmacy	5	62.5	11	26.2	4	4.9	14	8.8	11	32.4	5	17.2	50	14.2
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	3	37.5	14	33.3	65	80.3	120	75.5	13	38.2	16	55.2	231	65.4
Other national or state organizations	-	-	13	31.0	7	8.6	25	15.7	10	29.4	8	27.6	63	17.8
International organizations	-	-	4	9.5	5	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	2.6
TOTAL	8	100.0	42	100.0	81	100.0	159	100.0	34	100.0	29	100.0	353	100.0

TABLE XVI: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	4	26.7	8	13.6	1	2.8	18	18.9	5	22.7	10	13.0	46	15.2
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; medicare	4	26.7	11	18.6	3	8.6	11	11.6	2	9.1	6	7.8	37	12.2
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	-	-	9	23.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	3.0
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	4	26.7	19	32.2	10	28.6	7	7.4	3	13.6	27	35.1	70	23.1
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	-	7	11.9	4	11.4	5	5.3	1	4.6	7	9.1	24	7.9
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	1	6.6	2	3.4	3	8.6	14	14.7	2	9.1	3	3.9	25	8.3

TABLE XVI - Cont.

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Communism; Socialism	1	6.6	-	-	-	-	3	3.2	-	-	-	-	4	1.3
National economy (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3.2	-	-	1	1.2	4	1.3
National economy (specific; depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.	1	6.6	12	20.3	5	14.3	34	35.7	9	40.9	23	29.9	84	27.7
TOTAL	15	100.0	59	100.0	35	100.0	95	100.0	22	100.0	77	100.0	303	100.0

TABLE XVII: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
This journal; reference to articles	-	-	23	50.0	3	6.2	12	23.1	28	56.0	-	-	66	27.3
Editor; editorial policy	2	13.3	1	2.2	1	2.1	2	3.8	2	4.0	1	3.1	9	3.7
Other journals; literature; publications	-	-	4	8.7	4	8.3	-	-	3	6.0	4	12.5	15	6.2
Official compendia	8	53.4	4	8.7	26	54.3	5	9.6	5	10.0	10	31.3	58	23.9
Editorial tributes	3	20.0	4	8.7	7	14.6	11	21.2	-	-	2	6.2	27	11.1
Pharmacy personalities	-	-	3	6.5	1	2.1	9	17.3	4	8.0	12	37.5	29	11.9
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	2	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.7
Seasonal	2	13.3	7	15.2	4	8.3	13	25.0	8	16.0	3	9.4	37	15.2
TOTAL	15	100.0	46	100.0	48	100.0	52	100.0	50	100.0	32	100.0	243	100.0

TABLE XVIII: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A. Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	10	41.7	24	48.0	15	68.2	3	25.0	1	9.0	4	50.0	57	44.9
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	10	41.7	11	22.0	1	4.5	-	-	3	27.3	-	-	25	19.7
Economic, manpower, prescription	1	4.1	15	30.0	2	9.1	5	41.7	4	36.4	2	25.0	29	22.8
Awards, honors, prizes	3	12.5	-	-	4	18.2	4	33.3	3	27.3	2	25.0	16	12.6
TOTAL	24	100.0	50	100.0	22	100.0	12	100.0	11	100.0	8	100.0	127	100.0

TABLE XIX: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Standards of education	14	87.5	11	44.0	27	93.1	4	66.7	18	90.0	18	66.7	92	74.8
Support for education; valedictory	1	6.2	3	12.0	2	6.9	2	33.3	1	5.0	6	22.2	15	12.2
Internship; preceptors	1	6.3	2	8.0	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	4	3.2
Continuing education	-	-	9	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	11.1	12	9.8
TOTAL	16	100.0	25	100.0	29	100.0	6	100.0	20	100.0	27	100.0	123	100.0

TABLE XX: EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY JOURNAL

SUBJECT GROUPINGS	Am. J. Pharm.		Am. Prof. Pharm.		A.Ph.A. J.		N.A.R.D. J.		American Druggist		Drug Topics		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Miscellaneous; miscellany	6	66.7	6	18.9	1	16.7	7	53.8	-	-	3	27.3	23	30.3
Nostalgia, reflections	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.6
Virtues	-	-	11	35.5	-	-	1	7.7	3	50.0	6	54.5	21	27.6
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	1	11.1	14	45.6	5	83.3	5	38.5	3	50.0	2	18.2	30	39.5
TOTAL	9	100.0	31	100.0	6	100.0	13	100.0	6	100.0	11	100.0	76	100.0

CHAPTER VI

EDITORIAL VIEWS ON PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION

Up to this point, we have been concerned primarily with the numbers--or percentages--of editorials which have appeared in the six journals under consideration, both by period and by journal, and have suggested that frequency of appearance of any particular topic may be taken as a reliable indicator of editorial interest in that topic. The qualitative side of the coin must also be examined. For as important as the quantitative aspects of content analysis may be, they do not tell the whole story; it is necessary to supplement facts with opinions--the editors' opinions, and in their own words, preferably.

It is important at this stage to stress an inherent difference between historical research and the type of sociological research herein represented; in the former, given a gap in knowledge or a dispute, the historian may undertake a literature search in the contemporary books, journals, and records, utilizing the documents and his skill to bridge the gap or resolve the dispute; in the latter, given a prescribed universe of editorials from which to choose, the researcher must shoot the fish in his given barrel--randomly, if you will--and analyze the fish (or editorials) which come to the surface. Of course, the latter technique cannot produce the meaningful, in-depth

studies favored by contemporary historians; the rigidity of the content analysis design is a great step beyond mere hit-or-miss reading, however, and produces interesting results, as we shall see.

Secondly, it should be noted that the editorial subjects chosen for analysis in this and the following two chapters are not all-inclusive, for such an analysis would be as difficult to read as it would be to write, but are representative of the types of problems with which the profession of pharmacy is currently faced and in which the author has particular interest.

Standards of Education in Pharmacy

The forty-five years covered in this study witnessed the greatest upgrading in educational standards in the history of American pharmacy resulting, in part, from a concomitant multiplication in scientific knowledge. All schools of pharmacy in good standing with the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties (APCF; now the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy) had adopted a two-year curriculum of at least fifty weeks as the minimum requirement in 1907, a three-year course in 1925, a four-year course in 1932,[1] and finally a five-year

---

1. Lloyd E. Blauch and George L. Webster, The Pharmaceutical Curriculum (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952), p. 16, as cited by Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, op. cit., p. 213.

course in 1960.[2] Sonnedecker admits that these advances in educational requirements "often have been a response, not to the active demand of a majority, but to that of a minority who aspired to leave their profession a step beyond where they found it."[3] This minority found a voice in the American Journal of Pharmacy's editor, George M. Beringer, who reported the advent of the three-year curriculum announced by the ACPF at the 1920 meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association with these comments:

> Thoughtful pharmacists long ago realized that a sound professional superstructure, the pharmaceutical education now necessary, could not be erected . . . in two years of collegiate instruction, it appears to us as a rather anomalous position that this conference, many of whose leading members have been so vociferous in proclaiming for higher professional pharmacy, should have been so slow in recognizing the necessity for a more thorough collegiate education as a basis for professional status and still more strange that having come to such a realization that a public acknowledgement was required, they would still persist in delaying for five more years a reform that should be inaugurated at once.[4]

Eugene G. Eberle, editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association agreed that "the sooner

---

2. Glenn Sonnedecker, Kremers and Urdang's History of Pharmacy (third edition; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1963), p. 213.

3. Ibid., p. 226.

4. George M. Beringer, "The Sixty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association," American Journal of Pharmacy, 92: 359-60, June, 1920.

graduation in pharmacy becomes a prerequisite for those that deal in and prepare medicines, the better and more safely will the public be served," adding significantly, "everyone realizes the dangers that may result from undesirables in drug stores under prohibition regulations."[5]

Not all the editors agreed. Charles W. Parsons presented American Druggist's cautious stand on a similar proposal by the Minnesota State Pharmaceutical Association in 1921: "We are all in sympathy with the spirit which prompted these recommendations and with every movement and agency to facilitate the 'elevation' of pharmacy, but it is not wise to get the supply too far ahead of the demand."[6] By 1923, Parsons' stand was not so cautious:

> In our desire to make of pharmacy (or rather the drug business) a true "Profession," on a parity with law, medicine, theology, etc., are we not schooling a class of students who will not find opportunity to practice their profession in today's drug emporiums? . . . All that the public and the laws are demanding today is that the pharmacist be a "safe" man to minister to the people. He is not expected to be an expert biologist, chemist, pharmacognosist. He must be competent to occasionally compound prescriptions and afford related pharmaceutical service. But in the main he is regarded as a community general merchant, the greater part of whose activities consists of supplying the myriad and

---

5. E. G. Eberle, "Coordinating Pharmacal and Medical Endeavor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 245, April, 1921.

6. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Festina Lente," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 50, April, 1921.

> varied wants (other than pharmaceutical) of his patrons. . .. If the purpose of the college is to train its students as research chemists, expert analysts, etc., we have no criticism or objection . . . But if the pharmacy graduate is to serve only in the drug store, whether as prescriptionist or salesman, or both, don't give him so much of the "higher" training that nine-tenths of it will never be put to application.[7]

While Eberle, a former educator himself, staunchly maintained that "underlying professional attainments there must be adequate education,"[8] most pharmaceutical journal editors assumed a mildly progressive attitude concerning standards of pharmaceutical education during the early 1920's, and suggested expanded roles for the pharmacist with his "new" education. Heber W. Youngken, in a guest editorial for the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, called for more research by pharmacists: "It will be this research by a wider group of pharmacists that will more and more elevate the opinion of the laity toward the pharmaceutical profession."[9] Eberle suggested

---

7. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Selecting Pharmacy Students," American Druggist, 71: 49-50, March, 1923.

8. E. G. Eberle, "Drug Treatment: Past, Present, and Future," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 1052, December, 1923.

9. Heber W. Youngken, "Pharmacognosy and the Pharmacist," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 6, January, 1923.

that the expanded pharmaceutical curriculum could be "of equal or greater value"[10] as premedical training, and even Parsons was forced to admit that the three-year course would be of value to at least hospital pharmacists.[11]

If the editors were cautious in their statements concerning "higher" pharmaceutical education, they were forthright in their support of better preliminary education. Sonnedecker relates that agitators for better preliminary education around the turn of the century "met a sluggish, apathetic response in the profession."[12] However, by 1908 the newly-formed American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties was able to require "satisfactory completion of at least one year of work in an accredited high school or its equivalent"[13] as a minimum entrance requirement for its member schools, and two years of high school or the equivalent nine years later. By 1923 a four-year high school requirement became binding for membership, having been voted upon favorably at the 1921 annual meeting.[14] The hesitant

---

10. E. G. Eberle, "Progressive Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 825, October, 1921.

11. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Education for the Hospital Pharmacist," American Druggist, 71: 38, August, 1923.

12. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 219.

13. "By-laws of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties," Proceedings of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, 7: 45, 1906, cited by Sonnedecker, loc. cit.

14. Sonnedecker, loc. cit.

advance of the schools was spurred on by the so-called "New York incident," which took place just prior to the same meeting. The incident referred to a public statement by the Director of Professional Education of the University of the State of New York opposing the proposed four-year requirement, predicting that there would be no applications for registration in any state that adopted the requirement for several years, if ever. In a guest editorial in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Wilber J. Teeters remarked that the Director's statements so thoroughly aroused the Conference colleges that "apparently they are willing to go 'to the mat' on the proposition,"[15] and by 1923 Eberle was able to state that "the high schools offer the gauge that is reasonably adaptable, even though uniformity in methods and results does not obtain. . . . general adoption of graduation prerequisite by states will be very helpful, almost essential,"[16] and that "the higher educational requirements exacted by the schools and colleges of pharmacy for the admission of students are attracting more young men and women to them who can and will advantageously utilize their education for the advancement of pharmacy and

---

15. Wilbur J. Teeters, "High School Graduation As an Entrance Prerequisite to Colleges of Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 732, October, 1921.

16. E. G. Eberle, "Standardization of Pharmacy Schools," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 198, March, 1923.

thereby be of greatest value to the public."[17] By this time, of course, such statements were merely academic. Just how academic they were is revealed in a small study undertaken by the American Druggist in late 1922, which revealed that "fully seven-eighths" of all first-year students attending the schools of pharmacy responding to the questionnaire were graduates of a high school.[18] Even Parsons, a rather bilious man where pharmaceutical education is concerned, had to admit that "higher pharmaceutical education is an accomplished fact," and reflected on his study: "Surely, all who have at heart the real best interests of pharmacy as a profession as well as a mercantile calling will find encouragement and gratification in these statistics: such were our reasons for their collection."[19]

The advent of higher educational requirements to enter into the practice of pharmacy begged the questions which have been plaguing pharmaceutical educators since the Civil War: What should be taught in a school of pharmacy and to what degree should it be taught? Toward what goal should

---

17. E. G. Eberle, "Entrance Requirements of Schools and Colleges of Pharmacy and Their Matriculants," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 774, October, 1922.

18. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Eighty-nine Hundred Pharmacy College Students," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 28, December, 1922.

19. Ibid.

the profession strive, professional or mercantile? In the early 1920's, these questions were hotly debated in the pages of the American Druggist and commented upon editorially.[20] Reginald E. Dyer, editor of The Practical Druggist, remarked that:

> Because of the fact that the drug store has undertaken great changes in the last quarter century, taking on sideline after sideline, many are puzzled at these apparently opposite currents in pharmacy. On one hand we see the druggist developing into a merchandising specialist, and on the other hand we see at work the very definite tendency to raise the standards of pharmacy. Yet upon reflection one realizes the necessity for pharmacy to raise its bars, for better men are required in the drug store than ever before.[21]

Eberle agreed that merchandising "has an important part in the drug business," but the continuance of pharmacy as a real service depended upon its development as a profession, adding that "the fate of pharmacy depends upon the education of pharmacists."[22] He went on to explain that pharmaceutical education sought to organize knowledge and experience so as to give pharmacy students a wide background

---

20. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The Professional Education of the Pharmacist," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 68: 51-52, January, 1920; and "Disagreement in Amity," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 68: 53, May, 1920.

21. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Increasing Requirements in Pharmacy," The Practical Druggist, 40: 15, December, 1922.

22. E. G. Eberle, "Pharmaceutical Education and Development," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 412, June, 1921.

of information from which to reason. "The subjects in a pharmacy school are primarily vocational, but they contribute to a broad and liberal education which develops an understanding and makes the hand and brain work easier whether business or professional application is made, even though not in the drug business."[23] A year later, Eberle expanded his thoughts:

> The development of pharmacy differs from that of medical practice; in the latter professional service is followed by all; in that of the former, a considerable number engage in business and do not pursue pharmacy in fact, after graduation.
>
> Changes have occurred, but it is difficult to say exactly what the trend is, or will be. On this, to some extent, the classes in pharmacy schools hereafter will depend, but it must be recognized that the training for pharmacy fits individuals for many other activities, and year by year the pharmacy schools are turning out better-educated trained men and women, and some of these leave pharmacy to engage in other work wherein one or the other of the underlying sciences is essential, and the training for pharmacy very helpful.[24]

Eberle's latter statement hints at the classic rejoinder offered by pharmaceutical educators when criticized by practitioners for not presenting enough "practical" coursework.

---

23. Ibid., p. 413.

24. E. G. Eberle, "Commencements," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 406, June, 1922.

On the other side of the educational coin, Parsons was decrying the level of "business courses" currently offered by some schools of pharmacy and their responsibility in this area:

> Time has brought many changes; the pharmacist now must be a good business man; he cannot succeed with an education equipment that is purely and wholly professional. . . . some colleges have inaugurated business courses designed to supply the lack existing . . . . what is given is, thus far, largely a subterfuge. . . .
>
> . . . it is unfair for a college of pharmacy to discharge its graduates into their chosen vocation without the proper education and training to cope with its difficulties and problems, and these, now, as never before, are largely of a business, commercial, nature. The professional phase of the college courses is being rapidly developed (some think too rapidly); the commercial calls loudly for adequate recognition. What is the use in devising more and ever more strict requirements for entering and graduating from the college and "passing the board," if, when in today's and tomorrow's drug store the registered pharmacist is incompetent to carry on the major part of its activities.[25]

It is interesting to note at this point that Parsons perhaps more than any of his contemporaries in the early 1920's, made use of letters to the editor to spice up his editorial columns.[26] Although it had been realized for

---

25. Charles W. Parsons(?), "College Courses in Commercial Pharmacy," American Druggist, 71: 32, November, 1923.

26. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Many Men of Many Minds," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 24, February, 1922; and "More Discussion Is Invited," American Druggist, 71: 29, May, 1923.

some time that such letters represent only a literate minority, it is significant that Parsons, whose educational homilies grit, would use them to support his own convictions and, indeed, would cite this as a "service" to the profession.[27]

The American Journal of Pharmacy also expressed concern over the standards of pharmaceutical education, but in a different light, as George M. Beringer grumbled about the "faults in the method of imparting knowledge by teachers utterly lacking in experience . . . evidenced in many of the schools of pharmacy."[28] He continued,

> Post-graduate courses in medicine or in pharmacy should be based on a comprehensive knowledge and prior education in the fundamental branches of these practices and reserved for specialists who will not only apply the knowledge acquired in post-graduate work, but extend the existing knowledge in these fields through their further practice and research therein.[29]

As we have seen, the Depression assumed top editorial priority in the minds of the editors during the early 1930's, and only six editorials on standards of pharmaceutical education appeared in our sample for this period, even

---

27. Parsons(?), "Disagreement in Amity," loc. cit.

28. George M. Beringer, "The Faults of Medical Education," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 145, March, 1920.

29. Ibid.

though the four-year pharmacy curriculum went into effect in 1932. H. C. Christensen, at that time Secretary of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, is quoted in The Practical Druggist as being against making the laws covering the college requirement for reciprocal registration too restrictive, holding that "it would be a mistake to specify the number of years of attendance at a college of pharmacy."[30]

One is struck again and again in these and other editorials with an apologetic, even defensive, tone when educational standards are discussed and the almost compulsive desire for public approval following or even prior to any advance in standards. Thus, Eberle, while calling attention to the necessity for having pharmacists in charge of the pharmacies in all hospitals, stresses that "there is no reason whatever for declining professional recognition to pharmacists,"[31] and Fred B. Kilmer is moved to suggest that the cap and gown should be worn in the pharmacy "on proper occasions" to "exalt pharmacy."[32]

---

30. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Changes in Pharmacy Laws," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 49: 12, January, 1931.

31. E. G. Eberle, "The Application of Right Principles is Essential to Effect Right Relations," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 809, August, 1930.

32. Fred B. Kilmer, "The Cap and Gown in Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 104: 169, March, 1932.

If the economic ills America was suffering from during the early 1930's preoccupied our journal editors' thoughts, precluding them from much consideration of pharmaceutical education, the shock of America being embroiled in a second world war jolted them into considering several major educational problems. The problems revolved about: 1) the shortage of pharmacists on the home front caused by the new lottery-type draft; 2) the concern with the quality of accelerated courses (i.e., three twelve-month years rather than four nine-month years) offered by the colleges of pharmacy to alleviate this shortage; 3) the concern with the quality of the personnel the Armed Forces were training to carry out pharmaceutical functions, and 4) the plea for proper recognition of the pharmacist and his profession in the Armed Forces. Sonnedecker traces the generally sad tale of the pharmacist in the military; suffice it to say that by the end of World War I, pharmacists began to be commissioned as officers, with the status and salaries commensurate with other professionals. By 1926, the educational requirements for pharmacists in government service were finally defined, but another decade was required before graduation from a recognized four-year school of pharmacy was made a prerequisite for appointment to the Medical Administrative Corps, although the number of pharmacist-officers to be appointed was limited to sixteen. This development finally culminated in the creation of a special

Pharmacy Corps in the Army (July 12, 1943), which was to survive as a separate unit barely four years.[33]

Such titles as "We Must Act Now," "Don't Scuttle the Ship!," "Don't Budge!," "We Must Maintain Our Standards," and simply "Survival" abound in the editorials dealing with standards of pharmaceutical education in the early 1940's, and give some idea of the emotionally-charged editorial atmosphere engendered by the war. Another former educator, Dr. Robert L. Swain led it off in the editorial columns of Drug Topics in 1941. Reflecting on the fact that the number of pharmacy graduates in recent years had been below replacement requirements, Swain pointed to an "acute" shortage of pharmacists in some parts of the country. He noted that some colleges of pharmacy were faced with an entering class less than half the size of that of 1940, citing the high wages in defense industries and fear of the draft as contributing factors. "We're confronted with facts, not theory," he stated; "there'll be a serious shortage of pharmacists in 1945 unless a freshman class of at least normal size enters our colleges of pharmacy this fall."[34] Nine months later, Swain attacked Virginia's attempt to repeal that state's educational requirements for pharmacist registration, calling upon pharmacists to

---

33. Sonnedecker, op. cit., pp. 303-305.

34. Robert L. Swain, "We Must Act Now," Drug Topics, 85: 20, July 28, 1941.

keep a watchful eye alert for similar attempts, and noted the "alarming" growth in the number of patent medicine stores. "If we can beat off attacks now," he stated, "we will be infinitely better prepared to cope with the problem of the post-war period. 'Don't budge' should be our motto as we steel ourselves against the wiles, deceptions and sophistries of the times."[35]

At that same time, Dr. Linwood F. Tice, newly appointed editor of the American Journal of Pharmacy, agreed, stating that "one of the very real dangers that confronts the profession of pharmacy as a result of the present emergency is the tendency which is already evident to lower our professional and educational standards."[36] He reported that most of the educational institutions were abandoning their time-honored "teaching as usual" programs and were planning to convert themselves into continuous-operation units, eliminating vacation periods for both students and faculty. Tice went on to explain:

> It is, however, understood in educational circles that acceleration shall not and must not mean lowering either the quality or quantity of instruction given the student. . . . we must never revert to the days when pharmaceutical education was little else than a vocational training program. . . .

---

35. Robert L. Swain, "Don't Budge!," Drug Topics, 86: 18, March 23, 1942.

36. L. F. Tice, "We Must Maintain Our Standards," American Journal of Pharmacy, 114: 70, March, 1942.

> With the pressure for needed man-power which is being felt with ever increasing force we may well expect to see certain groups, interested only in their continued exploitation of pharmacy, demanding all sorts of steps to alleviate their need of low cost personnel, with no thought and less care as to its effect on what we have labored so carefully to build--real professional status.[37]

By April of the following year, Tice complained, "the over-all picture of pharmacy today is indeed a sorry mess."[38] Pointing to new bills which attempted to lower the requirements to operate a community pharmacy "for the duration only" or as emergency measures, he predicted that "more and more of such vicious attempts to destroy our profession may be expected as the pressure becomes more intense," blaming "those retail groups to whom a college diploma and professional licensure mean nothing but another man whom they can place in one of their own establishments to exploit and manipulate solely for profit," and called on "real pharmacists" to "make a clean break with all those commercially-minded groups which constantly operate so as to place pharmacy at a disadvantage."[39] And in September Swain noted the "sharp

---

37. Ibid., pp. 70-71.

38. L. F. Tice, "Who Is Responsible?," American Journal of Pharmacy, 115: 121, April, 1943.

39. Ibid., pp. 120-121.

criticism" which had been leveled at the proposal to further accelerate the rigidly squeezed thirty-six month pharmacy curriculum by compressing it to twenty-four months.[40] Comparing the proposal to the old "cram school technique," Swain stated that "Pharmacy deans in growing numbers are apprehensive lest permanent injury be done our educational program," and warned that "the sharply accelerated curriculum may play into the hands of those who would debase our educational standards by a return to the old sub-collegiate two-year course."[41]

The N.A.R.D. Journal, which, as we have seen, had remained curiously silent on the topic of pharmaceutical education up to this time, sprang to its defense through the pen of John W. Dargavel, N.A.R.D.'s Executive Secretary and Editorial Director. Dargavel had heard disturbing rumors of a "definite, although partially concealed" attempt to revert to a two- or three-year pharmacy curriculum "behind a smoke-screen of wartime necessity," and indicated that not one group, but several were "moving in this dangerous direction."[42] Dargavel reasoned that the multiplication of competition, the lowering of the profession's standards in the eyes of the public, and the

---

40. Robert L. Swain, "They Don't Like It," Drug Topics, 87: 38, September 6, 1943.

41. Ibid.

42. John W. Dargavel(?), "Don't Scuttle the Ship!," N.A.R.D. Journal, 65: 1112, July 19, 1943.

glut of cheap help would be of no advantage to pharmacy. "Soon," he predicted, "it would be translated into mushroom stores without good financial, professional or business experience foundations--stores able only to ruin the drug business for all engaged in it--such as was the case for a time after the last war."[43] And Dargavel seemed to echo Tice when he concluded:

> It could be of advantage only to those who wish to exploit cheap help to their own advantage and profit, and to those seeking a greater number of outlets for drug products, regardless of the quality of the service rendered.[44]

In October, Dargavel rejoiced at the firm stand taken by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy against a proposal, "purported to have the sanction of governmental circles," which would have reduced and accelerated the pharmacy curriculum to twenty-four months.[45] Swain agreed: "Obviously, they intend to take no chances of having their views misunderstood on this basic matter," adding, "it should be our fixed intention to get back to our

---

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

45. John W. Dargavel(?), "Victory for Pharmacy," N.A.R.D. Journal, 65: 1467, October 4, 1943.

established four year curriculum as full and as promptly as circumstances permit."[46]

It was Linwood F. Tice, however, who took the firmest stand against continued acceleration of pharmaceutical education at the end of the war, calling upon the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) to give serious consideration to a definite policy regarding this matter since only chaos would result unless the colleges acted in some uniform manner. "Let us not do that which is merely expedient," he pleaded, "but rather that which is educationally and socially sound."[47] Tice also pointed to the social problem of rapidly increasing the number of graduates seeking positions in the reconversion period, stating that the present serious shortage of manpower could easily change in a few months to oversupply. "We should not encourage the return of that period when the government by means of the CCC took care of thousands of unemployed and disillusioned youths."[48] Finally, Tice spoke out against those who advocated the heavy use of teaching films and other devices in pharmaceutical education. "This is not

---

46. Robert L. Swain, "For the War Only," Drug Topics, 87: 36, October 4, 1943.

47. L. F. Tice, "Acceleration As a Continued Policy for Pharmaceutical Education," American Journal of Pharmacy, 116: 255, July, 1944.

48. Ibid.

true education," he stated, and furthermore, it "leads to fascism, as we have already learned only too well."[49]

Glenn Sonnedecker, young editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, also analyzed the post-war situation: "Personally, we have not been able to work up much concern about personnel shortages in the postwar era," he said coolly. "On the other hand, we do not believe there have necessarily been too many pharmacists. There does seem to be much merit in the argument that there have been too many drugstores."[50] He continued:

> Some mechanism should be set up at once in pharmacy, preferably operating through state pharmaceutical associations, that would help guide pharmacists discharged from the armed forces to areas where their services are most needed, particularly when new pharmacies are to be opened.
>
> It is a solemn obligation of the profession to try to provide an adequate pharmaceutical service to citizens in every community in the country. Beyond that point it is difficult to see how mere increase in numbers would strengthen the profession.[51]

Sonnedecker also called for support from the profession for the AACP proposal to introduce one year of prepharmacy

---

49. Ibid., p. 254.

50. Glenn Sonnedecker, "Education for What?," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 5: 284, November, 1944.

51. Ibid., p. 285.

training in addition to the four-year professional curriculum. Such a program, he argued, would better prepare the student to practice in the future.

> We agree with the often heard statement that pharmacy has been making admirable progress, but too often takes its "progressive" steps after years of bickering--years after allied professions have made comparable advances and go on to meet new problems.
>
> Such a curriculum would place pharmaceutical education more nearly on the level of medicine and dentistry. . . . Prepharmacy training would also provide a broader cultural background, which is not only a mark of the professional man but is extremely practical in a calling where public impressions count so much.[52]

Predicting a "rough and stormy course" ahead for the five-year program proponents, Sonnedecker pointed to a "reassuring" attitude on the part of pharmaceutical educators, stating that "there is practically no possibility that standards will be changed until a considerable period has elapsed after the war."[53]

The rough and stormy course Sonnedecker had foreseen in 1944 for the proponents of a mandatory five-year pharmacy curriculum had not abated by the early 1950's. Indeed, the intervening years had stirred up rather than

---

52. Ibid., pp. 284, 285.

53. Ibid., p. 284.

poured oil on the troubled waters of pharmaceutical education. The Pharmaceutical Survey (1946-1949), a comprehensive study of pharmacy, pharmaceutical practices, and new areas of pharmaceutical specialization conducted by the American Council on Education under the direction of Dr. Edward C. Elliott, had recommended that the existing four-year curriculum be continued and improved but that schools "adequately staffed and financed" develop a six-year curriculum leading to the professional degree of Doctor of Pharmacy.[54] During this same period, Dean B. V. Christensen had almost single-handedly made a five-year curriculum a minimum requisite for the Bachelor of Science degree in Pharmacy at Ohio State University (1948).

Madeline Oxford Holland, now editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, reported on the rejection of a five-year program by the AACP at their annual meeting in 1951:

> While those who speak in generalities claim the pharmacist can be trained in 4 years experts who have studied this problem carefully claim it is impossible. One has only to tabulate the courses needed in the curriculum to see that 4 years is inadequate. . . .
>
> It is unfortunate that too many pharmaceutical educators either succumbed to the pressure of outside groups or failed

---

54. Edward C. Elliott, The General Report of the Pharmaceutical Survey 1946-49, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950), p. 230.

> completely to envision the challenge of training pharmacists to meet the professional needs of the future.[55]

By 1953, thirteen other colleges of pharmacy were offering courses of more than four years, either as the minimum course or on an optional basis, with a four-year course being offered concurrently. The Pharmaceutical Curriculum, by Dr. Lloyd E. Blauch, assistant director in charge of curriculum studies for the Pharmaceutical Survey, and Dr. George Webster of the University of Illinois, published at this time, also added fuel to the fiery editorials of the day. "With all of the drugs that must be studied today it is almost impossible to cram it all into four years and still obtain a well-rounded education in other respects," Holland stated. "We believe that the pharmacist needs more of the cultural subjects as well as the technical courses which are necessary for him to practice his profession."[56] Tice agreed: "Can we be sure that today's training will fully meet the needs thirty or forty years hence?" he asked. "If not, now not then, is the time to act."[57] Tice continued:

---

55. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Association Meetings," American Professional Pharmacist, 17: 799, September, 1951.

56. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Enrollments in Colleges," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 21, January, 1953.

57. L. F. Tice, "The Pharmaceutical Curriculum," American Journal of Pharmacy, 125: 221, July, 1953.

> There are many in our profession who labor under the false concept that by opposing change it can be prevented or at least indefinitely postponed.
>
> . . . If pharmacy is to maintain its position let alone better it, pharmacists must be prepared to meet the challenge. Some would have us do this by a policy of containment, i.e., let the changes occur and then try by emergency measures to meet them. Such a policy is fatal.[58]

Robert P. Fischelis, another educator, approached the matter on quite a different tack. Fischelis called upon all pharmaceutical organizations to support the five-year curriculum, and suggested that the money spent by some to scuttle the proposal might be better spent in endowments to schools and colleges of pharmacy. One of the "reprehensible activities" of the opponents of the five-year curriculum, Fischelis stated, was their distortion of the findings of the Pharmaceutical Survey, which essentially called for an improvement of the present four-year curriculum:

> No responsible educator or member of our profession has advocated an increase in the length of the professional course in pharmacy . . . . it is possible not only to turn out a good basically trained pharmacist in four years, but it is possible to include in such a professional course the necessary electives to enable the student to qualify for general pharmaceutical practice . . . and other specialties.[59]

---

58. Ibid.

59. Robert P. Fischelis, "Eisenhower Has the Answer," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 14: 694-695.

What Fischelis had in mind was recruiting pharmacy students from junior colleges, rather than high schools, which would actually result in a quasi six-year program. Besides, Fischelis stated, only the better students were finishing the present four-year program in four years; many were taking five years to finish in the better schools and colleges of pharmacy.[60]

From that point on in our sample, the compromise five-year program received strong support, as recorded in the editorial columns of Drug Topics,[61] and was adopted at the 1954 meeting of the AACP, the program "to be implemented by accredited colleges of pharmacy in 1960."[62] Yet, in 1960, Swain found it necessary to suggest that,

> Pharmacy educators would do well to begin a program of orientation with respect to the "five year course" directed towards the pharmacy practitioner who, in too many instances, shows signs of confusion and resentment over the extension of our educational undergraduate program.[63]

---

60. Ibid.

61. Robert L. Swain, "5 Year Study Favored," Drug Topics, 97: 68, September 7, 1953; and "5 Year Program Wins," Drug Topics, 98: 50, April 19, 1954.

62. Robert L. Swain, "Let's Close Ranks," Drug Topics, 98: 66, October 4, 1954.

63. Robert L. Swain, "Orientation Required," Drug Topics, 104: 32, October 24, 1960.

The early 1960's, indeed, reflected a significant change of thinking on the part of our pharmaceutical journal editors regarding the state of pharmaceutical education: The five-year curriculum was a fait accompli, and engendered little further debate; America was momentarily not at war, and pharmacy student deferments from the draft aroused little editorial comment, as swords were beaten back into spatulas; the economy was healthy and the profession of pharmacy was prosperous. Rather than beat the dead horse of the virtues of extemporaneous compounding, the editors began exploring new areas of professional services which the pharmacist could be expected to supply. The relative novelty of the expanded professional service concept begged the question whether the present curriculum was adequately preparing the pharmacy student to assume such a role; the cycle was complete.

Irving Rubin, by design and out of the American Druggist, now wore the colors of the American Professional Pharmacist, and called upon the colleges to develop a required course in detailing "to help erase any mental block a pharmacist may have--and to give him confidence--with respect to visiting a physician or other prescriber and discussing drug therapy."[64] In a subsequent editorial,

---

64. Irving Rubin,"'Detailing' Should Be a 'Must' Course In the College Curriculum," American Professional Pharmacist, 28: 23, April, 1962.

Rubin stated that "colleges should explore the possibilities of courses which would enable the RxMan to become an expert in what is needed to care for bed patients."[65] In addition, Rubin called for expertise on the part of the pharmacist in the fields of surgical appliances, laboratory procedures, and audiology, and also suggested that he might provide ambulance service.[66] Louis E. Kazin, new editor of Drug Topics, agreed:

> In our opinion, colleges of pharmacy have the responsibility of training young people to meet the expanding opportunities awaiting the graduating pharmacist.
>
> Those who would restrict this graduate to a rigid mold of activity may be doing us more harm than good.[67]

Tice pressed the point:

> There seems little doubt that a rapid transition is taking place in the kind of work done by pharmacists as compared with that done in the past. Their professional skill and knowledge are of too great a value for them to be concerned with . . . simple business transactions . . . .

---

65. Irving Rubin, "The Curriculum Should Help the RxMan Earn a Living Via Professional Service," American Professional Pharmacist, 29: 22, June, 1963.

66. Ibid., pp. 22-23.

67. Louis E. Kazin, "Too Much Emotion," Drug Topics, 107: 46 , August 12, 1963.

> . . . The profession itself is becoming much more distinctly aware of its public and professional responsibilities and is moving unhesitatingly toward their fulfillment. . . . Those who would like to see pharmacy retrogress and pharmacist relegated to the status of simple merchants have but one thing as their principle motivation; namely, mass merchandising and distribution.[68]

In summing up his discussion of pharmaceutical education, Sonnedecker quoted Rufus A. Lyman, who looking back on efforts to advance pharmaceutical education during the forty-five years we have been considering, concluded:

> Some were violently opposed, the majority were indifferent. Support did come from a few farseeing laymen who recognized the importance of the pharmacist and the drugstore in the public health service . . . .[69]

As we have seen, support also came from the editors of America's pharmaceutical journals.

Internship and Practical Experience in Pharmacy

The value, length, and quality of practical experience or internship in pharmacy has been debated among pharmaceutical educators since Albert B. Prescott's classic

---

68. L. F. Tice, "Opportunities in Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 135: 394-395, November, 1963.

69. Rufus A. Lyman, "The American Institute of the History of Pharmacy and the Pharmaceutical Press," (mimeographed address read at Madison, Wisconsin, 1942), p. 5, cited by Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 226.

address on "Pharmaceutical Education" at the 1871 meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association, in which he explained the advantages of a truly scientific education and gave his reasons for believing a preliminary apprenticeship, before graduation, unnecessary.[70] In general, one year had been sliced off the traditional four-year apprenticeship for every year added to the pharmacy curriculum up to the advent of the four-year program in 1932, when several states, notably Ohio, abandoned the Apprenticeship requirement entirely. The requirement was soon found to be necessary, and quickly reinstated, and by the early 1960's, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy had agreed to require a supervised internship of at least six months, usually one year, in addition to the five-year curriculum established in 1960.

Although only a handful of editorials specifically dealing with the subject of pharmacy internship were drawn in contrast to those dealing with other aspects of pharmaceutical education, we may catch a brief glimpse of editorial opinions on the topic for at least two of the periods under consideration, the early 1920's and the early 1950's.

Commenting upon an irate letter to the editor decrying "an epoch of educational madness," calling for "the

---

70. Albert B. Prescott, "Pharmaceutical Education," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 425-429, 1871, cited by Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, op. cit., p. 209.

unostentatious and industrious boy who plods at the sink" and is "willing to 'learn' pharmacy from the ground up," Charles S. Parsons replied in a 1922 number of the American Druggist:

> The druggist today has no time and no opportunity to act as preceptor. Much of the apprentice's tasks of fifty years since are now done in the manufacturing laboratory. . . . and under present day conditions the drug store boy would be limited in his service mainly to porter work and message delivery.
>
> Perhaps it is regrettable that most of the State pharmacy laws require high school and college of pharmacy education before board examination, but this is a condition and not a theory that confronts us, and the boy who would expect to enter pharmacy without going through this routine of educational training would never become qualified for the duties and responsibilities laid upon the modern day pharmacist.[71]

Reginald E. Dyer, editor of The Practical Druggist, also drew his readers' attention to a complaint from one of his readers that "it is difficult in many drug stores for juniors to obtain the experience as required by the State law of New York." The correspondent reasoned that as long as "75 per cent of the business of the drug store is non-pharmaceutical . . . an apprentice who some day intends to be the proprietor of one of these stores must perfect

---

71. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The Apprentice Question," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 31, March, 1922.

himself in all branches of the business, even in the dressing of windows and keeping the store in a clean, presentable condition."[72] Dyer replied:

> It is unfortunately true that there are many stores, where a young man will not be put in the way of the experience he has a right to expect.. . . However, in the opinion of many observers these conditions are only temporary and improvement will come.[73]

Dyer drew a conclusion which is still echoed today:

> It is up to the young man himself if he wants to be a true pharmacist, to select a good pharmacy in which to learn his profession.[74]

In the early 1950's, the question of practical experience again caused a flurry of editorials, prompted in part, at least, by a recommendation in the then recently published report of the Pharmaceutical Survey which stated that "the present requirements for practical experience as a prerequisite for licensure be modified to be of more practical value or else abolished."[75]

---

72. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Drug Store Experience," The Practical Druggist, 40: 13, October, 1924.

73. Ibid.

74. Ibid., p. 14.

75. Elliott, op. cit., p. 225.

Linwood F. Tice, editor of the American Journal of Pharmacy, commented on the infeasibility of colleges of pharmacy giving or supervising practical experience, as had been suggested by some as a method of upgrading the quality of the program. "The model pharmacy on the college campus can never duplicate the actual working conditions in the retail store, the prescription pharmacy or the busy hospital pharmacy," Tice wrote.[76] He continued:

> Undoubtedly, practical experience can and should be of great value to the prospective pharmacist. It can be of value only when it is gained in those establishments where pharmacy is practiced on a proper professional plane and where the pharmacist-preceptor faces his teaching and training task with a sense of responsibility to both the intern and the profession. If interns are simply considered cheap help, given menial tasks to do, and no counsel nor advice they cannot be expected to gain much from this experience.[77]

Madeline Oxford Holland, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, agreed:

> We thoroughly concur that practical experience is essential if it is under proper supervision and in a retail pharmacy where proper pharmaceutical experience--not merchandising--will be obtained. . . . Preceptors too often

---

76. L. F. Tice, "Rational Practical Experience," American Journal of Pharmacy, 125: 116, April, 1953.

77. Ibid.

> have a tendency to make errand boys and janitors of the interns when they really should be adding to the knowledge they have acquired in college. . . . It can and should be a cooperative effort with mutual advantages to both preceptor and intern.[78]

"Yet," Sonnedecker rightly concludes, "in spite of their variation, few instances can be found where full responsibilities of a license have been granted without requiring some supervised practice in a pharmacy, despite the growing importance of academic education . . . and despite difficulties in maintaining meaningful standards of internship."[79]

Continuing Education in Pharmacy

Although some pharmaceutical journals, notably the Western Druggist and The Pharmaceutical Era, had taken the lead in developing courses in pharmaceutical instruction by correspondence in the late nineteenth century in an attempt to offset the widespread lack of even minimal technical education in pharmacy, it would be some time before true in-service--or "extension work"--in higher education would be developed.[80] Sonnedecker points out that "the most that

---

78. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Preceptorship," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 117, May, 1952.

79. Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 210.

80. Ibid., pp. 216-218.

can be said for home-study endeavors, is that they simplified and systematized the self-education of perhaps thousands of youths in pharmacy who never would enter the doors of a school of pharmacy. In contrast, extension work characteristic of the present century has been primarily to simplify and systematize a continuing education for practitioners who already have a sound academic education."[81]

The need for continuing education in pharmacy was recognized in 1922 by Eugene G. Eberle, editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, in an editorial entitled "Re-education of Pharmacists": "It is possible . . . to utilize colleges and schools, local, state and national organizations to a larger extent by a greater number for re-education in pharmacy."[82] A pharmacy college professor, writing to Charles W. Parsons at the American Druggist, agreed. "We cannot very well teach chemistry at a distance, yet if we used all of our time for two or three years teaching chemistry alone, our graduates would not know too much of this science," the professor said; "there are many subjects, however, which can be taught by extension so-called and correspondence."[83] Dean Jacob Diner was

---

81. Ibid., p. 218.

82. E. G. Eberle, "Reeducation of Pharmacists," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 994, December, 1922.

83. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Another Angle of the Education Problem," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 27, November, 1922.

reported by Eberle in 1924 to be in favor of post-graduate courses for pharmacists,[84] but it was Dean C. B. Jordan of the Purdue University College of Pharmacy who is credited with establishing the first university extension division to supply practicing pharmacists with professional and economic information. An editorial announcement in The Practical Druggist and Spatula stated that the service

> . . . will carry on state-wide and individual research to determine the underlying facts and figures for efficient drug store operation. With this knowledge, and the experience of the men in the department, they anticipate being in a position to give the druggist any help needed. This service will extend even further than giving mere suggestions, as they will be able to send men to the store itself to put into operation such methods as are needed.[85]

The service was free, except for the travelling expenses of the Purdue instructors, and problems such as products and sales analysis, merchandising and advertising, stimulation and supervision of the sales force, sales promotion, stock control, and accounting systems were offered as examples of how this initial attempt at pharmaceutical "Extension Service" could be of use to the practicing pharmacist.[86]

---

84. E. G. Eberle, "Vocational Training and Education," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 1106, December, 1924.

85. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Help for the Pharmacist," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 48: 12, October, 1930.

86. Ibid.

No further mention of continuing education in pharmacy was found until E. F. Kelly's initial editorial in the new Practical Pharmacy Edition of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association in January, 1940. The editorial referred to the "refresher course" carried out in Wisconsin and other states with the aid of federal funds (George-Dean Act of 1937) provided "for training in distributive occupational subjects." Kelly stated:

> Refresher courses of one kind or another are being carried on in other states and the movement should be extended. The developments in Pharmacy are now so extensive and so rapid that pharmacists, like the members of other health professions, cannot keep up with them unless they are assisted. In meeting this need the schools and colleges of Pharmacy can make themselves of assistance to the pharmacists directly and personally.[87]

It was John N. McDonnell, however, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, who gave the greatest boost to continuing education in pharmacy in the early 1940's. "Daily, more is demanded of the pharmacist. In considerable extent (in many cases even in spite of himself) he is becoming the supply depot for information," McDonnell said.[88]

---

87. E. F. Kelly(?), "Education in Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 1: 4, January, 1940.

88. John N. McDonnell(?), "Cooperation," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 151, March, 1940.

> It is difficult for today's pharmacist, no matter how well-equipped or well-endowed he may be with ability, experience, and materiel, to cope at all times with the demands for scientific, professional and public health information, from the professions and the public.
>
> The colleges must recognize that their duty and service to Pharmacy and the pharmacists ceases not with graduation day . . . .[89]

In another editorial, McDonnell pointed out that with the rapid progress in medicine, the physicians would be turning to the pharmacist more and more for aid in choosing the best therapeutic agent, route, and means of administration, after he has completed his diagnosis, since the pharmacist was a specialist in drugs. This concept, McDonnell believed, "is bringing a definite demand upon Pharmacy. It requires that the pharmacist increase his comprehension of pharmacology, of chemistry, of physiology, and anatomy. This very complexity is making of today's and tomorrow's pharmacist a scientist as well as a professional man."[90] In a subsequent issue, McDonnell again looked down from his editorial aerie:

> We believe that the duty of pharmaceutical journals is to "keep the pharmacist abreast of the time." We try to do just

---

89. Ibid.

90. John N. McDonnell, "A Solution in Complexity," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 487, August, 1940.

> that, as best we can. Our contemporaries are precious few.
>
> The demand by pharmacists (not all pharmacists; not half the number of pharmacists; but enough to guarantee the future progress and prestige and advancement of Pharmacy) has brought into being the newest of movements in Pharmacy. The extension lectures, the post-graduate clinics, the seminars on modern pharmaceutical practice, all are the spontaneous answer to a need of today. From coast to coast, Pharmacy colleges and associations have developed such plans for the assistance of those practicing pharmacists who are intelligent enough to attend. This is a healthy sign of a growing profession.[91]

Finally, near the end of the war, McDonnell expressed concern for the pharmacists in the Armed Forces who would be returning to civilian practice soon:

> Great advances have been made in their absence. They will have forgotten much that they learned in college and in practice. They must be re-educated through the medium of refresher courses of some substance. Pharmacy as a whole, through its associations and its colleges, must now plan for early adoption such training periods to be offered at cost (or without it) to those men who return to practice, in a new world of Pharmacy.[92]

---

91. John N. McDonnell, "Extension Pharmacy," American Professional Pharmacist, 7: 291, May, 1941.

92. John N. McDonnell(?), "Retraining of Veterans," American Professional Pharmacist, 9: 783, December, 1943.

Yet, despite McDonnell's--and others'--preaching and cajoling, it was found after World War II that 43 of 50 schools reporting to the Pharmaceutical Survey still had no "in-service" or "off-campus" training program for practicing pharmacists.[93] Pointing to the importance of pharmacists' keeping up to date with mushrooming pharmaceutical advances, the Survey urged that each school "recognize and assume responsibility for providing organized programs of in-service professional instruction." Such programs, it was recommended, should include "refresher courses conducted at the institution, programs of reading, correspondence study courses, and the systematic visitation and personal counselling of pharmacists.[94]

Madeline Oxford Holland drew her readers' attention to this finding in the April, 1950 issue of the American Professional Pharmacist. "As usual," she said, "many have discussed this possibility but few have acted."[95] She then commended Rutgers University College of Pharmacy as "the first to inaugurate a Pharmaceutical Extension Service aimed at aiding pharmacists to keep abreast of both scientific and business progress." The service was supported by "a substantial appropriation" from the University

---

93. Elliott, op. cit., p. 231.

94. Ibid., p. 232.

95. Madeline Oxford Holland(?), "Rutgers Extension Service," American Professional Pharmacist, 16: 337, April, 1950.

trustees, and directed, interestingly enough, by Louis E. Kazin, who four years later would become associate editor to Drug Topics' failing Dr. Robert W. Swain. Swain, who had also praised Rutgers' extension program,[96] noted in 1954 that attendance of pharmacists at continuing education programs "still continues to be disappointingly sparse."[97]

> These "clinics" are organized on a practical basis. Retail pharmacists are consulted on subject matter. Every effort is made to provide the practicing druggist with first-hand knowledge so necessary in the competitive battle now taking shape.
>
> Now more than ever before business success, as well as professional responsibility, demands a continuous reeducational process. The druggist who fails to recognize this fact may "wither on the vine" of inefficiency as more aggressive and enlightened competitors pass him by.[98]

When Kazin himself assumed the editorial chair, he attached more of a public relations motive to continuing pharmaceutical education than had the economically-minded Swain, when he stated that "every retail pharmacist recognizes

---

96. Robert L. Swain, "New Jersey Progress," Drug Topics, 94: 44, March 20, 1950.

97. Robert L. Swain, "Time for Learnin'," Drug Topics, 98: 60, April 5, 1954.

98. Ibid.

that he can't do a sound public relations job for his profession, answer criticism on prescription prices and refute distortions made by aspiring politicians without possessing all the facts available."[99]

By the early 1960's, the potential value of continuing education programs to the profession had motivated sufficient cooperation between organized practitioners and the schools to give a national trend to the movement. In some areas, however, a lack of predominately professional or post-graduate character in the instruction and emphasis on brief "refresher" courses had left room for further improvement and expansion.[100] Since many continuing education programs at this time were faltering for lack of dollar nourishment, the American Pharmaceutical Association in 1960 attempted to remedy this situation by appearing before a House subcommittee in favor of a bill (HR-357) which would have provided federal assistance for extension programs in the sciences and the professions. In commenting upon this development, Holland effectively summed up the need for continuing pharmaceutical education:

> Pharmacists, in this day and age, cannot expect to ride along on what they learned in undergraduate studies. They cannot

---

99. Louis A. Kazin(?), "College Seminars," Drug Topics, 104: 40, November 7, 1960.

100. Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 218.

stop with graduation but must go on learning each day, each month and each year.

.....

Everyone in the profession of Pharmacy should be concerned with this problem for it is their future as well as that of the profession which is at stake.[101]

---

101. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Extension Programs," American Professional Pharmacist, 26: 367, 400, June, 1960.

CHAPTER VII

EDITORIAL VIEWS OF PHARMACEUTICAL ORGANIZATIONS

In Chapter VI we saw that editorial commentary on the trials and tribulations of contemporary pharmaceutical education occupied a fascinating, yet relatively minor role in the total editorial scenario we here attempt to unfold (only 4.1 per cent; review Table XI, Chapter V). Such is not the case with editorials dealing with the problems, programs, plans, and products of pharmaceutical organizations for such editorials account for nearly one-eighth of the total number of editorials drawn in our sample (review Tables XI and XV, Chapter V).

Since two of the six journals considered in this study--the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the N.A.R.D. Journal--are the official organs of their respective organizations, and since the American Pharmaceutical Association and the National Association of Retail Druggists are the largest, if not the most influential, organizations of their type in American pharmacy, it seems only fitting that we devote some space to the views held by the editors of these two journals concerning the affairs, attitudes, and acclaim due their respective associations during the five five-year periods under consideration, and fitting that we compare and contrast these

views with those of their contemporaries associated with other journals.

Secondly, we should examine briefly the editors' attitudes toward state and local pharmaceutical associations drawn for these periods, as well as their attitudes toward the several new national associations which came into existence during these same periods.

Finally, we should trace editorial concern with the several approaches toward maintaining effective communication, coordination, and division of labor between not only the American Pharmaceutical Association and the National Association of Retail Druggists, but also among all pharmacy organizations on all levels--city, county, state, regional, national, and international. Some of these movements--variously styled as "affiliation," "federation," "one voice for pharmacy," or simply "cooperation"--have either aborted or died in infancy for a complex of reasons never fully evaluated.[1] We hope to bring into focus some of the causative organisms responsible for this peculiar form of puerperal fever by looking closely at the journal editor in his role as a midwife.

American Pharmaceutical Association

The history and development of the American Pharmaceutical Association is ably traced by Sonnedecker;[2]

---

1. Glenn Sonnedecker, Kremers and Urdang's History of Pharmacy (third edition; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1963), p. 189.
2. Ibid., pp. 181-188.

recall only that the American Pharmaceutical Association (A.Ph.A.) was the first national pharmaceutical association, and for a long time the only one. Founded in 1852, it represented, defended, and promoted all areas of pharmaceutical interest, particularly the scientific, ethical, and educational aspects, although the commercial and legal ramifications of pharmacy were not neglected. Sonnedecker states that the A.Ph.A. has always been the guardian, although not always the initiator, of progressive movements concerning American pharmacy.[3]

We saw in Chapter III that the post of editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association was initially closely associated with that of secretary (now executive director) of the Association prior to 1941; in the ensuing years the pattern has not been quite as consistent. Secretary Robert P. Fischelis served as editorial director of the Journal for a year, and subsequently served as editor (February 1951 - March 1956); his successor, William S. Apple, held the dual post from August 1959 through December 1961. This duality of responsibilities often limited the effectiveness of the editorial parries and thrusts, since it is difficult to convey total objectivity toward a policy or program one has been instrumental in designing. Both praising and panning become uncomfortable pastimes in such a situation, and, more often than

---

3. Ibid., p. 181.

not, one is left with an official association line to hew to and a dull ax.

Editorials dealing with Association affairs during the early 1920's and early 1930's were long, rather dry, and often mere announcements of convention sites, increases in Association dues, committee reports, or biographies of incoming national officers, rather than opinionated commentaries on Association objectives and goals, though the latter appeared with some regularity, and it is this portion of editorial comment to which we will address the bulk of our remarks. In all fairness, however, we should mention that the format of the A.Ph.A. Journal prior to 1940 did not conveniently allow for such announcements to be made except in the editorial columns, for they would likely have been lost in the scientific papers, committee reports, and speeches that followed.

For example, E. G. Eberle adopted a conservative tone when discussing the Association's plans for 1920.[4] The plans included a revision of the code of ethics and of nomination procedures, increasing membership and income, and developing A.Ph.A. publications for more extended usefulness. "Real progress never jumps," Eberle said cautiously, "all of these propositions constitute weighty problems, deserving of deep reflection. The American

---

4. E. G. Eberle, "The Washington Pharmaceutical Meetings," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 466-468, May, 1920.

Pharmaceutical Association cannot afford to act hastily; it is always building for the future, and its influence pervades every pharmaceutical and medical activity. Its problems are as varied as the interests represented in the Association are complex."[5] L. E. Sayre, in a guest editorial, continued in the same tone. Pointing to the rapid growth of the Association both by individual participation and organizational federation, Sayre stated that the new elements should be properly "converted into the ideal for which the Association has always stood." This is important not only for the good of the Association but also for the good of the initiated."[6] Sayre also believed that federation seemed to bring about an "ardent desire" for "material progress." In seeking this material progress, Sayre held, the Association should conserve that element for which it had stood for nearly three-quarters of a century. "Ethical progress should keep pace with the material," he said, and then drove his point home:

> There seems to be a natural dislike . . . to conservatism. . . . Let us substitute a progressive policy for a conservative, if it is best to do so, but let it be done without attacking the individual who advocates the latter policy.

---

5. Ibid., p. 466.

6. L. E. Sayre, "The Spirit of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 855, September, 1920.

> Conservatism does not mean stagnation by any means. . . . More advancement is made along the line of conservative progress than by radical, half-baked ideas which sound well, but which only too often lead to disaster.[7]

In another guest editorial in the same issue, Wortley F. Rudd played the role of the devil's advocate:

> . . . we now have a nucleus capable of doing for American Pharmacy much the same kind of work that the American Medical Association has done for medicine.
>
> In order to take advantage of this pressing opportunity . . . those entrusted with the management of its affairs should begin promptly to plan for much bigger things. Possibilities of the American Pharmaceutical Association are far too big for its future development to be vested entirely in men whose chief work is something else than the business of the Association . . . .
>
> . . . The writer would like to see a full discussion of this matter through the Pharmaceutical Press . . . unless it is given . . . prompt consideration . . . the American Pharmaceutical Association will have lost its greatest opportunity for a larger service to all of American Pharmacy.[8]

The editors of other pharmaceutical journals were kindly disposed toward the American Pharmaceutical Association during the early 1920's. The A.Ph.A. found a staunch

---

7. Ibid., pp. 855-856.

8. Wortley F. Rudd, "Periods in the Growth of National Associations," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 856-857, September, 1920.

supporter in George M. Beringer, editor of the American Journal of Pharmacy. In discussing the first meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council of the A.Ph.A., Beringer pointed to "the wisdom of this innovation" and praised the planned nation-wide movement for pharmaceutical research which came out of that initial meeting. "The various endowments for research already created or in contemplation have given little or no consideration to the needs of pharmacy . . . . They propose that the American Pharmaceutical Association shall take the initiative and propose the establishment of The American Pharmaceutical Research Endowment."[9] All of the national pharmaceutical, drug, and chemical organizations were to be invited to join in the foundation of the Endowment, each association or interest having an equal share in the responsibilities of planning and management, which was "a strong point in its favor as it is at once removed to the high plain of a truly altruistic movement that should merit endorsement and the hearty support of all."[10] Such lofty motives not withstanding, however, it was not until 1942 that such funds were to become available for research through the efforts of the American Council for Pharmaceutical Education.

---

9. George M. Beringer, "Meeting of the A.Ph.A. Executive Committee," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 79-80, February, 1920.

10. Ibid., p. 81.

In an editorial entitled "The Service of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Romaine Pierson, editor of The Practical Druggist, praised the A.Ph.A., yet at the same time pointed to a weakness which was not to be corrected for four decades:

> During the course of its long existence the Association has constantly afforded a forum for all pharmaceutical interests. Its membership includes retail pharmacists, hospital pharmacists, manufacturers, wholesale druggists, analytical chemists, pharmaceutical editors, college professors--in short, persons interested in pharmacy from any standpoint. With an organization so heterogeneous, the association must acknowledge certain limitations. Each group will have special interests which, from their very nature, demand attention beyond that which the Association can well provide.[11]

And Samuel C. Henry, stalwart editor of the N.A.R.D. Journal, was moved to say that,

> The A.Ph.A. has long held and continues to hold a position of importance in matters pharmaceutical and by reason of this fact the organization should be sustained in every practical way by all interests concerned in or connected with pharmacy.
>
> .....
>
> The Journal . . . expresses the hope that . . . the A.Ph.A. may be fortified in its efforts to uplift and strengthen pharmacy in all its branches.[12]

---

11. Romaine Pierson(?), "The Service of the American Pharmaceutical Association," The Practical Druggist, 39: 14, September, 1921.

12. Samuel C. Henry, "The A.Ph.A. Meeting," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 646, July 14, 1921.

Finally, Charles W. Parsons, editor of the American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, stated:

> Under the aegis of the A.Ph.A. are those features, ideals, and principles of pharmacy, both professional and commercial, which find no place in the numerous other organizations, but which are vital to life, endeavor and attainment in this avocation.

Apparently Parsons found no fault with the breadth of the A.Ph.A.'s membership, but did note the conservative aura mentioned above:

> . . . there has been a recent injection of young, new blood, enthusiasm and ambition destined to increase the effectiveness of the organization without deviation from the lines and principles so wisely established by its founder and always consistently followed by the old war horses in its directorate and officialdom. The A.Ph.A. does not encourage radicalism, but always endorses and supports those propositions and measures which may be termed conservatively progressive. What American pharmacy would be without this wise old mother . . . is difficult to estimate.[13]

Whatever personal allegiance Parsons may have felt toward the A.Ph.A. is suspect when he discussed the increase in Association dues recently voted by the membership.[14] The

---

13. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The A.Ph.A. Meeting," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 33, October, 1921.

14. E. G. Eberle, "Higher Association Dues," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 944, October, 1920.

increase had come about because of increased production costs of the Journal, and all Parsons needed was an irate letter to the editor for a springboard:

> Mr. Ford . . . thinks there should be a different and better journal, at a lower rather than a higher price, and one which would derive a self sustaining and profit producing income from wider circulation and more and higher priced advertising patronage.. . . His shafts are not directed against individuals, rather at the machine and its guiding principles. He will have many supporters in his contention that . . . the Journal is a liability, not an asset, and that there is apparent a decided trend toward a diminishing membership rather than the much-to-be-desired steady and rapid increase. His remedy . . . may not be the best and most effective, but it is a suggested remedy any way.[15]

Eberle's eventual reply should have convinced his readers that he was one of a small group who would eventually inherit the earth: "Related publications dare to request their members to speak for the encouragement of their official organs, so that their income may be increased and their service improved and, in that same spirit, we invite the active cooperation of our members."[16]

---

15. Charles W. Parsons(?), "'I Object' Says Mr. Ford," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 68: 36-37, November, 1920.

16. E. G. Eberle, "The Going and the Coming Year," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 994, December, 1922.

By 1924 it had been decided that what American pharmacy really needed was a permanent home. From that time to its completion nearly ten years later, the American Institute of Pharmacy, as it was called, dominated the editorial columns of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association. Early in the fund-raising campaign, Editor Eberle called upon A.Ph.A. officers and other assorted dignitaries to say important things like, "let's go!" and "all shoulders to the wheel!"[17] The project was heartily supported by Reginald E. Dyer,[18] who replaced Pierson at the editorial desk of The Practical Druggist, and, interestingly enough, by Parsons.[19] It is also interesting to note that the original concept of the Institute was that it was to house all pharmaceutical associations, even the National Association of Retail Druggists.[20] In this concept lay one of the

---

17. Arno Viehoever, "The Home for American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 396-397, May, 1924; H. C. Christensen, "Why An American Pharmacy Building Is Needed," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 397-398, May, 1924.

18. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "The All Pharmacy Headquarters Campaign," The Practical Druggist, 42: 13-14, September, 1924; "The A.Ph.A. Headquarters Campaign," The Practical Druggist, 42: 15, June, 1924.

19. Charles W. Parsons(?), "A.Ph.A.," American Druggist, 72: 30, September, 1924; "The Headquarters Campaign," American Druggist, 72: 30, November, 1924.

20. Christensen, op. cit., p. 398; Dyer, loc. cit.

earliest sparks to the smudge of federation, which was to burst into flame in the early 1940's and be snuffed out a decade later, as we shall see.

During the early 1930's, the programs of the American Pharmaceutical Association moved steadily ahead, and the founding of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries (1927) and the Conference of Pharmaceutical Law Enforcement Officials (1929) under the aegis of the A.Ph.A. pointed to a new aggressiveness reflected in the Journal's editorials.[21] This aggressiveness culminated in a guest editorial by Robert L. Swain, newly elected president of the Association:

> . . . plans are now in progress for interesting the great retail group. I have asked the members of the A.Ph.A. state membership committees to furnish me with the names of those pharmacists who might be interested in the fundamental work carried on by the Association. Invitations will be sent to all whose names are submitted . . . . the great rank and file of pharmacists will be better fitted for their responsible professional duties by membership in the Association. The Association, too, will be placed in a better position, and thus more able to meet the demands made upon it, by a stronger and larger membership.[22]

---

21. E. G. Eberle, "Agencies for Increasing the Usefulness and Efficiency of Pharmaceutical Endeavor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 1048, October, 1930; "1932," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 5-6, January, 1932; E. F. Kelly, "The Toronto Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 845-848, September, 1932.

22. Robert L. Swain,"Plans for Increasing the Membership in the A.Ph.A.," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 1077, November, 1933.

The National Association of Retail Druggists (N.A.R.D.) did not let this tactic slip by without sounding an alarm in typical N.A.R.D. manner:

> The time is at hand to call a halt on the activities of outside interests seeking to weaken and, if possible, destroy the effectiveness of this organization in dealing with problems that chiefly concern retail druggists. Loyal members of the N.A.R.D. should not lose sight of the fact that such efforts are constantly being put forth and all fair-minded retailers, whether members of the association or not, are asked to keep this fact always in mind.[23]

The following month Eberle coyly reprinted an editorial from the Northern Ohio Druggist entitled "The Mother of American Pharmacy." The simile was not lost on the Journal's readers:

> Some of her offspring are often neglectful. Some seem irreverent, sometimes a bit bumptious, asserting that the old American Pharmaceutical Association is too pedantic, too traditional, too indulgent with scientific puttering and not sufficiently aware of pressing practical problems . . . . The old parent does not reply in kind. She knows that bumptiousness is only excessive self-esteem, a pardonable fault in youngsters. That youth is preoccupied with its own concerns, as properly it should be.[24]

---

23. Samuel C. Henry, "Your Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 54: 746, September 1, 1932.

24. E. G. Eberle, "The Mother of American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 993, October, 1932.

By the early 1940's, however, the mother had so many children she didn't know what to do. The children, lovingly nurtured and now of age and professionally ambitious, struck out on their own as the American College of Apothecaries (1940) and the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists (1942). How this affected the burgeoning federation movement will be discussed in a later section.

Robert W. Rodman, newly appointed editor of the Journal recounted the agonizing decision even to hold a convention during the war. The problems inherent in deferring sufficient pharmacists to maintain necessary pharmaceutical services and enough students and teachers of pharmacy, to fill the colleges already on accelerated programs, student loans, the Pharmacy Corps, WPB orders, OPA interpretations, and rumblings of post-war plans for socialized medicine led the Association to the realization that "it would be derelict in its duty to the profession and to the country if it failed to take the initiative in solving them."[25] The following month Rodman added, "The whole future of pharmacy may well depend upon the decisions which are made during the emergency."[26] Much the same line of reasoning was applied by Rodman to the necessity of

---

25. Robert W. Rodman, "To Denver in August," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 3: 195, June, 1942.

26. Robert W. Rodman, "War Problems Highlight Denver Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 3: 224, July, 1942.

holding a convention in 1943,[27] although it was not until after the war in 1945 that the Association decided for the second time not to hold its annual meeting.

Glenn Sonnedecker, who replaced Rodman in October, 1943, as editor of the Journal, took a deep look into the far-sighted planning by the Association that would facilitate the difficult transition to peacetime practice:

> An oversupply of pharmaceutical manpower in post-war years could well be as difficult a problem as the current shortage. Streamlined transportation may make the pharmacist on every corner no more necessary than a corner physician. Shorter working hours, born of wartime problems, will further reduce the number of pharmacists needed if the profession decides it can permanently dispense with the 15-hour day as other callings have, and still maintain adequate health service.
>
> Thousands of women will have entered the profession, accelerating the previous trend in this direction. They will not readily give up their newly won status . . .[28]

Sonnedecker also called for special refresher courses for the pharmacists returning from the battlefields, a permanent roster of pharmacists to help alleviate the maldistribution of pharmacists the country over, and a firm

---

27. Robert W. Rodman, "The Columbus Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 204-205, July, 1943.

28. Glenn Sonnedecker, "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 375, December, 1943.

stand concerning the extension of medical care to the people in the future. On the latter issue, Sonnedecker pointed out that recent developments indicated an expansion of pharmacies serving hospitals, group clinics, and health centers. "This should mean," he suggested, "more pharmaceutical service of a strictly professional nature, thereby raising the prestige of pharmacy as a whole. Our stand should be based on what effect such service will have on the public and on pharmacy rather than . . . on the opinions of those in other professions."[29] Finally, Sonnedecker foresaw the inevitability of a five-year curriculum and Medicare (the controversial Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of 1943):

> Wartime developments and future research will continue to increase the fund of technical knowledge that the pharmacist must have at his command [and] may portend the time when educational requirements must be raised still further if we are to keep pace with the other professions in the public health field.
>
> Government regulation . . . in matters affecting public health can be expected to increase rather than diminish. . . . the pharmacist can benefit by this trend if it is channelled into constructive action freed of regimentation and bureaucracy.
>
> The complexities of the developing American social pattern hold many other problems of concern to us. . . . Pharmacy must embark on a post-war program that has been worked out on the basis of experience rather than expediency. The program can be powered by pharmacy as a whole only by bringing all

---

29. Ibid., pp. 375-376.

> state and local groups into the project, . . . Those who will some day abruptly find themselves on the way will want to have a say as to where we're going.[30]

That all these visions eventually did come to pass testifies to the youthful editor's foresight. However, in the following year the A.Ph.A. Council went on record as being "opposed to the attempted regimentation of medical practices and any autocratic principles contained in Title 9" of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which was the section relating to medical benefits.[31]

Sonnedecker also drew his readers' attention to the Bernays Drug and Pharmaceutical Survey, an unpublished conglomerate of 1,200 typewritten pages of data and conclusions paid for by "a group from the pharmaceutical profession and the drug trades" and concerned mainly with "a better relationship between the drug trades and the pharmaceutical profession, and the public."[32] The Survey was critical and not well received. Sonnedecker reasoned that if the average drugstore had a low professional status in the eyes of the public, as the Bernays Survey

---

30. Ibid., p. 376.

31. Glenn Sonnedecker, "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 5: 3, January, 1944.

32. Edward L. Bernays, "The Bernays Drug and Pharmaceutical Survey," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Scientific Edition), 32: 369, December, 1943, cited by Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, op. cit., p. 225.

maintained, "perhaps a concurrent intra-professional relations program is in order, using the same machinery that is being set up for public relations."[33] Sonnedecker continued,

> . . . we only need to walk down Main Street to see why the public apparently questions the professional status of many pharmacists. The cluttered windows, the flambouyant patent medicine and soft drink signs, the expanding restaurant facilities . . . . The problem goes deeper than cleaning up the drugstore, we must clean up our minds to think and talk professionally. The corner pharmacy is where the public sees pharmacy and hears about it each day. If we epitomize our calling as a "business of selling merchandise through a retail store," who can blame the public for taking us at our word. If we do not live pharmacy as a profession, rivers of printers' ink from a public relations office cannot convincingly paint it otherwise.[34]

By the early 1950's, the American Pharmaceutical Association was embroiled in a series of squabbles with the N.A.R.D. which were to rend the delicate fabric of cooperation which had been so painstakingly woven during the war years between these two organizations. On the

---

33. Glenn Sonnedecker, "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 5: 128, May, 1944.

34. Ibid., pp. 128-129.

surface it appeared to be merely a disagreement on a legislative issue (the Durham-Humphrey bill); however, the rift went deeper, intensified by personal antagonism between the two strong personalities which represented the associations, Robert P. Fischelis of the A.Ph.A. and John W. Dargavel of the N.A.R.D. Some felt that Fischelis and a small handful of the old guard were in control of A.Ph.A. policy now, and that the Association was no longer representative of the profession. Madeline Oxford Holland, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist sprang to A.Ph.A.'s defense:

> While it is true that those who assumed the responsibility for the A.Ph.A. program are still carrying it, few others were willing to assume such a burden . . . . The A.Ph.A. is organized in such a way that it is impossible for a few individuals to "run the show" except through apathy and disinterest on the part of its members. If changes in policy and program are indeed needed it lies within the power of pharmacists to accomplish such changes.[35]

Dr. Robert W. Swain, former A.Ph.A. president, and editor of Drug Topics, also provided some needed support: "The A.Ph.A. is pharmacy's professional organization, and is entitled to the enthusiastic cooperation and support of

---

35. Madeline Oxford Holland, "A.Ph.A.," American Professional Pharmacist, 16: 335, April, 1950.

everyone concerned with the professional phases of pharmaceutical activities."[36]

Fischelis, who was editor of the A.Ph.A. Journal at the time, provided his own defense, and one notes the conservative tone of Eberle creeping back into the Journal's pages:

> There has probably never been a time . . . when individuals or groups within the profession have not felt that progress was too slow and new associations should be formed to expedite or change the methods of accomplishing things. The A.Ph.A. has seen such movements come and go while keeping steadfastly on its course, with the welfare of the profession as a whole, and the public which it serves, as its main concern.
>
> . . . the Association is accustomed . . . to dealing with complex problems and it has enjoyed a fair measure of success in pointing the way to their solution, if it has not been actually successful in solving them.[37]

And again when discussing a bit of legislation:

> . . . the American Pharmaceutical Association continuously bends its energies toward keeping the professional function of pharmacists before related professions and the government.
> .....
> As a non-profit educational, scientific, and research organization, the A.Ph.A.

---

36. Robert L. Swain, "APhA Convention," Drug Topics, 95: 38, July 30, 1951.

37. Robert P. Fischelis, "A.Ph.A. Branches Unite in Founders' Day Program," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 701, October, 1952.

> constantly makes its contributions of fact and information to the Congress and to administrative agencies on request. Its form of organization and status do not permit it to indulge in pressure lobbying.[38]

The early 1960's, however, found the A.Ph.A. involved in a wide variety of activities--professional, economic, legal, and governmental. Within the profession, such topics as the proposed third (and later, fourth) class of drugs, the professional fee concept, the California antitrust trials, the Kefauver investigations of the drug industry, and the thalidomide tragedies all kept drugs, drug prices, and the profession of pharmacy in general in the public spotlight and kept all pharmaceutical associations, including the A.Ph.A. on their toes defending the profession. Within the A.Ph.A., however, subtler changes were taking place. A recommendation to restrict A.Ph.A. active membership to pharmacists from the wide-open policy of accepting anyone "interested in the progress of the science and art of pharmacy" established in 1920 had originated in the 1957 interim meeting of the A.Ph.A. House of Delegates and slowly progressed to the general session of the 1961 Chicago convention where it was considered and finally

---

38. Robert P. Fischelis, "Professionalism Remains the Backbone of Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 12: 403, September, 1951.

adopted.[39] Journal editor George B. Griffenhagen commented at the time that "by recommending an associate membership category [for nonpharmacists], the House of Delegates has wisely provided for the future of such interested persons. The few hundred nonpharmacists who are presently active members will continue to enjoy privileges they have earned and . . . we believe that they will recognize that the . . . changes are . . . in the best interest of the Association."[40]

The editorial comments which the change precipitated were rapid, divided, and expected. Dr. Linwood F. Tice, editor of the American Journal of Pharmacy, took the lead:

> Re-establishing the American Pharmaceutical Association as the professional organization of pharmacists in the United States cannot help but develop a sense of professional "togetherness" . . . . It has been the lack of this feeling which for so long has caused pharmacists to engage in all sorts of acrimonious disputes . . . .
>
> We are totally unimpressed with the arguments of those who opposed this change . . . . that the American Pharmaceutical Association can no longer embrace all avenues of pharmacy is totally unconvincing, as is the allegation that this action . . . represents a "step backwards," . . . if American pharmacy and the American Pharmaceutical Association

---

39. George B. Griffenhagen(?), "For, By, and Of Pharmacists," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 147, March, 1961.

40. Ibid.

> has indeed been organized and functioning properly these many years, then why indeed do we presently suffer from so many professional problems which stem directly from poor organization and poor communications?[41]

The American Druggist and Drug Topics had opposed the change editorially, and Tice took the opportunity to strike a blow for editorial "freedom":

> . . . one would expect them to wish all areas of pharmacy on an equal footing, with those professionally trained having no special privilege and surely not in complete control of their own destiny. . . . it will be a healthy thing for American pharmacy when at least some of the publications which pharmacists read are those of their own creation and those which they themselves pay for. A profession which has not effective way of communicating with its members can hardly hope to achieve full professional status. Furthermore, a profession which is influenced primarily by a press which it does not control risks the loss of its professional identification.[42]

These and other organizational changes in the A.Ph.A.--notably within the House of Delegates--[43] during the early

---

41. L. F. Tice, "Progress for the Profession," American Journal of Pharmacy, 133: 124-125, April, 1961.

42. Ibid., pp. 125-126.

43. George B. Griffenhagen, "Fifty Years of Representation," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 141, March, 1962.

1960's gave strength to the Association's contention that it truly was the representative of American Pharmacy.

National Association of Retail Druggists

The relationship that eventually developed between the National Association of Retail Druggists and her mother, the American Pharmaceutical Association, would have been of great interest to an organizational psychoanalyst, yet a growing tendency toward direct dealings between manufacturer and consumer and a rapid expansion of ruinous price cutting, burdensome taxation, and competition from other retail outlets in the early 1880's forced the community pharmacists of that time to found other organizations primarily concerned with the commercial or business aspects of their profession. These commercial interests had not received much attention from the American Pharmaceutical Association (A.Ph.A.), and there was a tendency of definitely excluding matters of commercial concern from its proceedings.[44]

Urdang has deftly recounted the sixteen years of organizational fumblings which took place prior to the founding of the National Association of Retail Druggists (N.A.R.D.) at St. Louis in 1898.[45] For our purposes, we

---

44. George Urdang, "The Precedents of the N.A.R.D. and Its Founding Fifty Years Ago," American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 13: 358, April, 1949.

45. Ibid., pp. 358-375.

only need mention that the synthesis of these precursors took place at room temperature under mild pressure from no less an organizational catalyst than Joseph P. Remington of Philadelphia. The first by-product was the Section on Commercial Interests created within the A.Ph.A. in 1887. It soon became clear that while the Section could be used rather effectively in drafting and negotiating agreements with wholesalers and proprietors concerning the problem of price cutting, it was entirely beyond the scope of the Section to exert adequate supervision and safeguarding of the plans agreed upon. Meetings of the Section became characterized by a frantic lookout for some group willing and able to take over whatever action was required; hence it was with a sigh of relief that the A.Ph.A. in 1897 gave its consent to the founding of a national instrumentality for a kind of activity which had been proved beyond its power.

The development of the N.A.R.D. Journal has been traced in Chapter III; as in the case of the A.Ph.A., the editorial quill of the Journal and the secretarial pen of the Association were almost invariably dipped in the same inkwell during the years encompassed by this study, and it is often difficult to separate the grain of an Association idea from editorial chaff. During the five five-year periods considered, only two strong personalities stand out: N.A.R.D. Secretary Samuel C. Henry, who had accepted the editorial responsibility on a "temporary" basis in

1918 and wielded a heavy pen until his rather ignominious resignation in 1933, and John W. Dargavel, who held the dual post from then until 1945, continuing as Executive Secretary until his death in 1961. The latter, ably assisted in the early years by George A. Bender and later by Theodore Christianson, exerted a strong influence upon the retail drug trade through his editorials and, later, his messages as Executive Secretary to such an extent that even today the editorial columns of the N.A.R.D. Journal remain vestigial appendages to the messages of his successor, Willard B. Simmons.

There is a marked contrast between the conservative editorial tone of the A.Ph.A. Journal during the early 1920's and the defensive posture assumed by the N.A.R.D. Journal. More causist than cautious, the ersatz editor of the latter journal deigned only to discuss his Association's affairs, goals, and objectives when he believed it was under attack by "wrong thinkers." We have seen earlier that although both associations discussed themselves editorially to approximately the same extent (review Table XV, Chapter V), the N.A.R.D. Journal devoted proportionately less space to organizational affairs than did the A.Ph.A. publication (review Table XI, Chapter V). The slack, of course, was taken up by discussions of legislation affecting pharmacy, both pending and present, the area in which the N.A.R.D. has traditionally achieved success.

If a restrictive format may be used to excuse the early editors of the A.Ph.A. Journal for allowing the choice of convention sites and other organizational trivia to appear on their editorial pages, Henry had no such justification. A highly departmentalized, rather free-wheeling publication by the early 1920's, the N.A.R.D. Journal had ample space for such announcements, appearing as it did weekly, but Henry apparently felt they deserved his own peculiar touch, and convention sites assumed a major role in his discussions of his Association, from their choice ("Hurrah for Memphis!") to their incipience ("All Aboard for St. Louis!") to their coverage ("A Great Convention"). In this regard, a most remarkable statement appeared in a 1920 number of the Journal:

> Special rates for conventions are only allowed organizations of a religious or educational character, and while many of our readers doubtless agree that the N.A.R.D. might properly be classed under both these headings, still it has been impossible to convince the railroad officials that we are entitled to classification in either.[46]

What is even more remarkable is that the N.A.R.D. achieved this goal, and within two years.[47]

---

46. Samuel C. Henry, "Reduced Rates," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 991, September 2, 1920.

47. Samuel C. Henry, "Reduced Rates for the Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 36: 705-706, August 2, 1923.

A defensive tone pervaded Henry's editorials, as mentioned above, coloring his coverage of the 1920 Pharmacopoeial Convention. There had apparently been some difficulty in admitting the delegates from N.A.R.D., and while Henry stated that it was always his "purpose and desire to be fair and just in all statements made in these columns," he did not refrain from assuming that "it was Dr. Wood's desire and intention to undo the work of the convention and unseat the delegates" by his parliamentary play of asking the convention to reconsider its action.[48]

Again, in considering an open letter to the pharmaceutical press from the secretary of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association published in the Druggists' Circular, Henry assailed his "peculiar ideas," holding that if the gentleman was unaware of the great service rendered by the N.A.R.D. on behalf of the retail druggists of the nation, "then indeed is he to be pitied," for "the N.A.R.D. has no cause to apologize for the course it has pursued," adding that the organization "has consistently and persistently, in season and out, labored in the interests of the retail druggists of the land," and that it was "supported wholeheartedly and earnestly by the rank and file of the retail druggists of the nation."[49] Henry continued,

---

48. Samuel C. Henry, "More About the Pharmacopoeial Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 391-392, June 3, 1920.

49. Samuel C. Henry, "The N.A.R.D.," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 237, May 12, 1921.

> Our methods may not be of the hammer and tong variety to which some folks are accustomed but they do at least possess the virtue of accomplishing results . . . .
>
> . . . that a publication such as the Druggists Circular should lend itself to the affair to the extent to publishing such an uncalled for and unwarranted communication [is surprising], especially in view of the fact that the editor of that publication has personally attended several recent conventions of the N.A.R.D. . . . We have always strenuously avoided unnecessary controversies with individuals engaged in . . . the pharmaceutical press, but there are occasions when patience ceases to be a virtue.[50]

While delegates to the A.Ph.A. conventions considered standards of pharmaceutical education, the need for increasing scientific research, and the content of the official compendia, Henry drew his readers' attention to what he considered the real issues of the day, the deliberations at the N.A.R.D. convention. Rarely stepping down from the superlative, Henry pointed with pride to the firm stand taken by the N.A.R.D. on the questions of tax-free alcohol and the use of wines in medicinal preparations (pro) and sales tax, patent medicine tax, and compulsory health insurance (con), the latter of which would "not only be detrimental to the people . . . as a whole, but would in addition thereto be extremely obnoxious to the

---

50. Ibid.

pharmacists."[51] For example, at the St. Louis convention Henry "became convinced that the pharmacists of the nation have at last awakened to the necessity of action upon their part and the real usefulness of an organization such as the N.A.R.D., if their interests are to be safeguarded and the cause of pharmacy advanced."[52] The following year, in Denver, he commented that "with such an organization, upheld and sustained by an army of loyal and enthusiastic supporters, the outlook for the future of the retail pharmacist is indeed encouraging."[53] In Washington, it became "increasingly apparent that the retail druggists of the nation are coming more and more to realize their actual need of the N.A.R.D. around whose banner they must rally and present a solid front to a common foe."[54] Finally, Henry was overwhelmed by the Detroit meeting, "an event of transcendent importance. . . . one of the greatest events in the history of retail pharmacy in this country," regreting that it was

---

51. Samuel C. Henry, "The St. Louis Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 613, July 8, 1920.

52. Samuel C. Henry, "A Wonderful Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 213, September 30, 1920.

53. Samuel C. Henry, "N.A.R.D. Outlook," N.A.R.D. Journal, 33: 6, October 6, 1921.

54. Samuel C. Henry, "The Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 921, September 4, 1924.

"not possible for the pen of man to properly portray such events."[55] Henry's contemporaries, however, were not similarly impressed. For the most part, the few editorial references made to the N.A.R.D. and its meetings which appeared in the sample for this period were perfunctory in nature and matter-of-fact in tone. At one point, Charles W. Parsons, editor of the American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, remarked rather disgruntledly that "the only trade exhibit now of any consequence, and that not very much, is the one held in conjunction with the annual meetings of the N.A.R.D. Something bigger and better is worth thinking of."[56]

In discussing the organizational affairs of the N.A.R.D., Henry was equally vapid. At the time, the Association was struggling with an obsolescent resolutions-to-the-executive-committee form of government contrasting markedly with the progressive House of Delegates system set up by the A.Ph.A. in 1912, which allowed for state association representation much on the same basis as does the United States Congress. Nevertheless, Henry called the open session of the committee on resolutions "one of the outstanding features" of the

---

55. Samuel C. Henry, "Convention Proceedings," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 46, October 12, 1922.

56. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Drug Trade Exposition," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 38, September, 1922.

convention "where all resolutions which have been regularly presented are read and freely and fully discussed by those in attendance, after which they are carefully considered by the resolutions committee and reported back to the association, either favorably or otherwise."[57] The resolutions themselves covered "a wide field of activity," and were touted by Henry as being "instrumental in bringing about improved conditions in the retail drug trade and . . . stimulating . . . the efforts that are being put forth to secure closer co-operation with the other branches of the trade and with the various departments of the government."[58] By 1922, the N.A.R.D. had restricted elective offices in the Association to registered pharmacists whose chief occupation was centered in the retail trade, yet the actions of the executive committee with regard to the convention resolutions were not always accepted without some grousing.[59]

As early as 1921, Henry had found it necessary to try to recruit state association secretaries to the N.A.R.D. convention,[60] and by 1924 he was assuring them that the

---

57. Samuel C. Henry, "Convention Resolutions," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 597, July 14, 1921.

58. Samuel C. Henry, "A Successful Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 6, October 5, 1922.

59. Ibid.

60. Samuel C. Henry, "An Invitation," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 550, July 7, 1921.

resolutions adopted at their state meetings would receive "the utmost consideration" at the hands of the national convention because they reflect the views of the retailers."[61] At the time Henry wrote that,

> In order to accomplish the best results it is obviously essential that the attendance be large, also that all sections of the country be fully represented, for in the fulfillment of its mission as a national organization the N.A.R.D. must act for the druggists of every section of the country.
>
> . . . retail druggists are needlessly restricted in their service to humanity by departmental regulations of an impractical nature and . . . wanton official interference with legitimate business . . . . the right of protest and appeal is guaranteed the humblest citizen and this constitutional right should be exercised by the pharmacists of the nation when they meet in annual convention.[62]

He later stated that,

> . . . the N.A.R.D. has always been and must continue to be truly democratic, both in theory and practice. . . . those called to leadership . . . have invariably sought to learn the will of the members regarding all matters of interest or importance, especially those matters of a controversial nature, in order that the wishes of the majority might be

---

61. Samuel C. Henry, "Washington Invites You," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 674, July 24, 1924.

62. Samuel C. Henry, "Our Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 506, June 26, 1924.

> faithfully carried out. The fairness of such a course of action is readily recognized and admitted on all sides . . . .[63]

Henry's commentaries notwithstanding, when the bubble burst in 1929, the N.A.R.D. was in trouble. Plagued by inefficient and uneffective management and a lackadaisical membership which more often than not sought to reduce their overhead by discontinuing their allegiance, Henry at first dismissed the Depression as the temporary result of "an over abundance of radical ideas" and stated that it was apparent that "the skies are clearing;"[64] by the following year he was more defensive than ever.[65]

Attention was drawn to the fact that the executive committee had decided to open an office in Washington, D.C., with "a full time representative devoting his entire time to governmental matters affecting retail druggists from a legislative or administrative standpoint."[66] The office was to be quite apart from the American Institute of

---

63. Samuel C. Henry, "Opinions Sought," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 1053, September 11, 1924.

64. Samuel C. Henry, "An Outstanding Event," N.A.R.D. Journal, 52: 921-922, September 10, 1931; "The Big Convention Now On," N.A.R.D. Journal, 50: 1029-1030, September 18, 1930.

65. Samuel C. Henry, "Nearing the Great Event," N.A.R.D. Journal, 52: 957-958, September 17, 1931; "The Big Event," N.A.R.D. Journal, 53: 5-6, October 1, 1931; "The Recent Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 54: 881-882, October 6, 1932.

66. Samuel C. Henry, "N.A.R.D. Washington (D.C.) Office," N.A.R.D. Journal, 53: 398, December 3, 1931.

Pharmacy, under construction at the time. Despite the ecumenical feelers sent out at the onset of the latter project, the decision to build the Institute in Washington, D.C. rather than Chicago had apparently piqued Henry, who had assured his readers that if and when the N.A.R.D. built its permanent home, it would be "secured . . . without solicitation or assessment."[67] Of course, the N.A.R.D. had initially settled in Chicago, with its strong retailing flavor, but one can only speculate on what path American pharmacy might have taken if her two largest organizations had been housed together in one city.

It was Herbert R. Mayes, newly-appointed editor of the "new" American Druggist, who brought the inner conflict in the N.A.R.D.--glossed over in Henry's editorials--to the attention of the pharmacy world. In an editorial entitled "At Last the N.A.R.D. Membership Receives All the Facts," Mayes discussed the "present unfortunate condition of the N.A.R.D."[68] The story, briefly, revolved about a personal conflict between Henry and John Goode, at that time president of the Association. Goode had prepared a financial statement which "showed the true status of the association"

---

67. Samuel C. Henry, "Important Meeting of the Executive Committee," N.A.R.D. Journal, 34: 127, April 27, 1922.

68. Herbert R. Mayes, "At Last the N.A.R.D. Membership Receives All the Facts," American Druggist, 87: 35, June, 1933.

and the "unhappy management" to which it had recently been subjected; Henry was instructed to publish the statement in the May 4, 1933 issue of the Journal; Henry ignored the instruction, and instead launched into a bitter defense of himself, his integrity, and his efficiency.[69] Mayes extracted a telegram from Goode in which he "regretted that the secretary was so unfair as to refuse to publish my statement . . . . The association belongs to the members and they are entitled to the information contained in the audit. . . . He has again been instructed to print the report, in the May 18th issue."[70] Mayes went on,

> Yes, President Goode's report appears at last in the N.A.R.D. Journal. Mr. Henry stuck it in the back of the book, and launched into another defense of himself in the front of the book, but perhaps everybody should be grateful for the fact that Mr. Henry at length consented to publish the president's report at all.
>
> It would be an easy task to say unpleasant things about Mr. Henry's attitude. . . . Mr. Goode's analysis of the association's standing is complete and authentic and confirms the fears generally prevalent that the association must have an overhauling to protect what it still has left . . . Mr. Henry has undoubtedly been panicky and acted excitedly and needs pity rather than censure.[71]

---

69. Samuel C. Henry, "An Unwarranted Attack," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 317-319, April 20, 1933.

70. Mayes, loc. cit.

71. Ibid.; also see: Samuel C. Henry, "N.A.R.D. Audit," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 405-406, May 18, 1933, and John A. Goode, "A Message for the President Concerning the Financial Condition of the National Association of Retail Druggists," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 421-430, May, 18, 1933.

Finally, Goode made his own statement.[72] It was not surprising, therefore, to find Henry's "retirement" notice in a subsequent editorial.[73]

Although Henry's successor, George A. Bender, was not officially acknowledged on the masthead of the N.A.R.D. Journal until several months later, it became apparent that new Executive Secretary John W. Dargavel was calling the editorial shots. Adopting a terse, hard-hitting style far removed from Henry's defensive ruminatings, Dargavel seemed to epitomize the get-tough attitude which characterized the N.A.R.D. throughout his tenure. Editorials were short and to the point, and as many as eight or ten different topics appeared on the two pages reserved for that purpose. His recruitment editorials, for example, were far from subtle:

> . . . well backed, the N.A.R.D. becomes a formidable factor in national drug affairs--one that is respected by those who wish to co-operate, and feared by those who do not.
>
> Self-preservation demands that the independent retail druggists of the nation belong to and support the N.A.R.D. Through no other body may they present their case, if it comes to a showdown.

---

72. John A. Goode, "A Statement by the President, John A. Goode," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 508-510, June 15, 1933.

73. Samuel C. Henry, "Secretary Henry Retires as Editor of the Journal," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 506, June 15, 1933. Following an unsuccessful injunction filed against the N.A.R.D. Executive Committee to retain his position, Henry eventually found employment in the relative oblivion of the editorial staff of the American Druggist (see George A. Bender(?), "Congratulations," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 796, August 2, 1934).

> In no other organization do they have the full power and authority to act unitedly to secure for themselves the things they must have.
>
> The power of the N.A.R.D. in behalf of the retailer is great. It must be greater still . . . .
>
> Join the N.A.R.D. first.'[74]

And in a subsequent issue, Dargavel stated:

> The need for complete, compact, all-embracing organization was never so acute as it is today. Factionalists must definitely be ironed out. . . .
>
> . . . the association . . . finds itself at loggerheads with itself, threatened with impotency because of disorganization, and carried forward largely upon the shoulders of a few individuals.
>
> The fault lies not alone with individuals; responsibility rests equally upon a membership inclined in years past to let things run themselves, without their personal interest. The harvest of this apathy is now upon us.
>
> . . . if the rift continues, the association is doomed.
>
> It will require strong, courageous, vigorous, and judicious action . . . to rectify and rebuild the organization--but that is what must be done.[75]

During the next few months, Dargavel scotched rumors concerning the demise of the Journal, scolded the membership

---

74. John W. Dargavel, "Self-preservation," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 633, August 3, 1933.

75. John W. Dargavel, "Your Responsibility," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 681, August 17, 1933.

for indulging in too much politics at the convention, and took pot-shots at the Proprietary Association, discount drugstores, and wholesalers who sold merchandise to non-drug outlets.[76] "The N.A.R.D.," Dargavel wrote pugnaciously, "is unafraid of any other organization, and it is subservient to no other."[77] This change did not go by unnoticed, however; other journal editors, notably Jerry McQuade of Drug Topics and Reginald E. Dyer of The Practical Druggist and Spatula, perked up their ears and sharpened their quills. Wrote Dyer,

> . . . the interests of the N.A.R.D. are every retail druggists' interests.
>
> . . . The N.A.R.D. . . . has constantly worked along legislative and commercial lines to protect and advance the retail druggists' interests. . . . obnoxious bill have been defeated and bills favorable to the druggists' interests have been given every assistance, with the result that conditions in the retail drug business are much better than they would have been without this great influence.[78]

McQuade, on the other hand, devoted a nine-page editorial to a discussion of the N.A.R.D.'s code of fair business

---

76. John W. Dargavel, "For a Greater Journal," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 634, August 3, 1933; "The Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 1052, October 4, 1934; "Which Do YOU Desire?," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 795, August 2, 1934.

77. John W. Dargavel, "Undeveloped Power," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 682, August 17, 1933.

78. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "The N.A.R.D. Meeting at Boston," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 50: 8, August, 1932.

practices under the Industrial Recovery Act and agreed with N.A.R.D. president Monte Powell that a fifteen-minute closing of all drug stores in the country would be an effective protest against code violations.[79] McQuade also took an active part in N.A.R.D. affairs: Disagreeing with the method employed by the Association to nominate its presidential candidates, McQuade instituted a nationwide poll of N.A.R.D. members to indicate who might be popular choices, and proposed to ask each of those nominated for his platform, since, as he said, "Drug Topics believes that the position of president of the National Association of Retail Druggists is one of the most important in all drug association work."[80] McQuade also urged the N.A.R.D. to substitute a working platform for the often ineffectual series of resolutions which "never constitute a sufficiently comprehensive program which the executive officers of an association may use as a guide in their activities," and took the liberty of preparing a suggested guide for the N.A.R.D. in writing such a platform.[81]

---

79. Jerry McQuade, "How The N.A.R.D. Worked Out Its Code," Drug Topics, 49: 39-43ff., August, 1933; "15-Minute Closing," Drug Topics, 50: 14, March 26, 1934.

80. Jerry McQuade, "By Popular Choice," Drug Topics, 50: 14, August 13, 1934.

81. Jerry McQuade, "A Grave Responsibility," Drug Topics, 50: 18, September 24, 1934.

During the early years of World War II, the N.A.R.D. Journal ventured editorially into the problems which followed its hard-fought battle for Fair Trade; the new Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and similar state statutes, governmental inquiries into trade associations operating in the drug industry, wholesaler discounts, and others. Apparently not suffering the patriotic pangs which troubled the A.Ph.A., the N.A.R.D. regularly scheduled its conventions, and editorials urged members to attend as an American privilege and duty.[82] Even John N. McDonnell, editor of the then recently-founded American Professional Pharmacist was moved to say that,

> . . . . the National Association of Retail Druggists . . . deserves the interest and support of practicing pharmacists. While its activities in the past have been mostly commercial and legislative, it is showing an awakening interest in professionalism that is gratifying to those of us who hold the latter of primary importance.[83]

Dargavel's column, "Editorially Speaking," now emblazoned with the Stars and Stripes, persisted as the only editorial

---

82. George A. Bender(?), "Our Convention--an American Privilege," N.A.R.D. Journal, 62: 1331, September 19, 1940; "We Are Privileged to Meet," N.A.R.D. Journal, 64: 1307, October 1, 1942.

83. John N. McDonnell, "Commercial," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 553, September, 1940.

voice of the Journal until October, 1945. At that time, associate editor Theodore Christianson replaced Bender as editor, and started his own column, "From the Editor's Desk," the following month.

Christianson's editorials, and those of his successor, Peter J. Sletterdahl (1948), appeared irregularly until 1954, at which time they became a regular feature. Innocuous in tone and limited in size and scope, their editorials commented politely on current events affecting the practice of pharmacy. The policies and goals of the N.A.R.D. as an association--as well as a good deal of hellfire and brimstone during the early 1950's--continued to emanate from the pen of Dargavel in a series of "messages" from the executive secretary, a practice which has been continued by his successor, Willard B. Simmons.*

A series of events in the early 1950's, notably the Schwegman decision, which shook the very foundations of the fair-trade legislation for which the N.A.R.D. had so valiantly fought (1951), the events leading up to the passage of the Durham-Humphrey amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act the same year, and increasing inroads made by supermarkets, discount houses, and other low-margin distributors into the traditional marketing

---

*Our sampling design prevented the inclusion of Dargavel's messages, revealing as they may be, once a regular pattern of editorials had been established.

patterns of drugs and drug-related items through pharmacies kept the N.A.R.D.'s hands full, and it is perhaps understandable that neither the Journal's editor nor Dargavel devoted much time to preaching their Association's philosophy. Other journal editors apparently felt the same way and, indeed, one of the few editors who mentioned the N.A.R.D. at all--in an organizational sense--was Drug Topics' Dr. Robert L. Swain:

> The N.A.R.D. is a purposeful, practical and resourceful organization. It merits and should receive the confidence, support and enthusiastic cooperation of all pharmacists who want to see the drug store a stable and strong distribution center.[84]

By the early 1960's, the troubled waters of fair trade had been muddied considerably by various decisions and appeals which continued to move up and down the courts. The N.A.R.D. had clearly lost its firm hold on the situation and, in the minds of some, its raison d'etre. Casting about for a new banner to replace the tattered ensign of fair trade, the N.A.R.D. fell upon the Kefauver hearings, prepaid prescription insurance, Medicare, quality stabilization legislation, and, finally, the "dangers" of state affiliation with the A.Ph.A. Much of this commentary appeared in the executive secretary's messages, some of it

---

84. Robert L. Swain, "Great N.A.R.D. Meeting," Drug Topics, 95: 50, November 5, 1951.

in the Journal's editorials; again, specific coverage of controversial issues precluded clear-cut editorial statements of the Association's purposes and objectives. Perhaps they were taken for granted; perhaps they were assumed to have been ingrained by earlier editors or indoctrinated at conventions. In any case, such statements did not appear in the sample of Journal editorials after the early 1940's, a marked contrast with the editorial policies of the A.Ph.A. Taken separately, the two editorial policies are interesting; taken in concert, they are remarkable, as we shall see.

Other National, State, and Local Associations

The first state pharmaceutical association, that of Maine, was founded in 1867, fifteen years after the founding of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and was heartily welcomed by the American Journal of Pharmacy,[85] many of whose editors "were among the most active leaders" in the young national organization. Sonnedecker points out, however, that the Journal did not recognize at this time that the Maine association was not merely another local group, but represented the entire state, an entirely new concept.[86] Over three-quarters of the present number of

---

85. William Procter, Jr., "Maine Pharmaceutical Association," American Journal of Pharmacy, 40: 88-89, January, 1868, cited by Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, op. cit., p. 179.

86. Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 179.

state pharmaceutical associations were established within another two decades;[87] at the time C. Lewis Diehl, writing in the Journal, referred to them as "the children of the American Pharmaceutical Association,"[88] and, indeed, the A.Ph.A. stimulated the founding of these organizations wherever and whenever it could, generally through the efforts of its general secretary, John M. Maisch.[89]

The importance of state and local pharmaceutical organizations varied greatly in the eyes of the journal editors in our sample. Ignored by some, given short shrift by most, and lauded by few, these groups generally languished at the hands of the editors, yet it is interesting to note that those who supported this grass-roots movement in the organization of American pharmacy were not always the ones who came out in favor of federation (review Table XV, Chapter V).

During the early 1920's, The Practical Druggist, under the steady hand of its editor-publisher, Romaine Pierson, and later under the stewardship of Reginald E. Dyer (f. 1922), could always be relied upon to say a few kind words in behalf of the state associations. "Convention

---

87. Ibid., p. 379.

88. C. Lewis Diehl, "Report on the Progress of Pharmacy," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 32 (1884), p. 32, cited by Sonnedecker, op. cit.,p. 180.

89. Sonnedecker, op. cit., pp. 179-181.

time for most of the annual State meetings is now at hand," Pierson noted, "and, of course," he assumed, "our readers are going."[90] Or, "We are in the midst of the 'annual meeting' season and the convention reports in this issue are interesting and to the friends of organization, encouraging reading."[91] Pierson, however, was not altogether altruistic in this regard, nor, as a publisher, was he unaware of the impact of a local item on its constituency:

> Read the convention proceedings, notices, all the items pertaining to organizations . . . in this number. If you are not a member it will make you one; if you are a member, it will make you more enthusiastic to find out how hard the officers of the various associations are working in your behalf.[92]

Pierson's successor, Reginald E. Dyer, shared his predecessor's convictions, if not his originality in wording; many of the above leads appeared year after year, suggesting, as we have mentioned before, that many editorials in The Practical Druggist were merely written to entice the reader to read further.[93] The American Druggist also used

---

90. Romaine Pierson(?), "Your State Meeting," The Practical Druggist, 38: 17, June, 1920.

91. Romaine Pierson(?), "Organization Going Strong," The Practical Druggist, 39: 16, July, 1921.

92. Ibid.

93. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Your State Meeting," The Practical Druggist, 40: 16, June, 1922; "The State Meetings," The Practical Druggist, 40: 13, July, 1922; "Your State Meeting," The Practical Druggist, 41: 14, June, 1923.

this editorial play, referring to an article by the president of the National Association of Retail Druggists (N.A.R.D.).[94]

Indeed, the editorial references to state and local pharmaceutical associations in the N.A.R.D. Journal represent the strongest support these organizations received in the early 1920's. For example, editor Samuel C. Henry, in reviewing the activities of the various state associations, noted that he often received inquiries which pointed out that the views expressed by local officials at state meetings did not always agree with those published in the Journal. He hastened to add that "before an opinion is expressed upon such matters in these columns, the question is carefully weighed from every angle, the law and regulations being carefully considered."[95]

Henry often took the opportunity to promote the cause of the state associations, and maintained that "nothing related to the practice of pharmacy is of greater importance to the individual pharmacist within the bounds of a state than the establishment and maintenance of a sound, active, progressive state association."[96] "We should like to see a

---

94. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The Service and Power of the Local Association," American Druggist, 72: 42, May, 1924.

95. Samuel C. Henry, "Governmental Regulations," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 742, July 29, 1920.

96. Samuel C. Henry, "State Conventions," N.A.R.D. Journal, 37: 746, January 31, 1924.

strong pharmaceutical association in every state in the union, loyally and wholeheartedly supported by the pharmacists of the state, for . . . [it] would prove a most potent factor in defending the rights of the individual members."[97]

Another editorial hinted that the N.A.R.D. might have a vested interest in such a movement:

> If pharmacy is to progress we must be fully organized. We believe that in order to accomplish the best results we must have strong local and state associations, as well as the national organizations. We are of the opinion that state associations can best be built up on the county unit plan and that by the formation and sustenation of these county organizations, working in harmony with and through the state and national bodies, a point of contact is established through which the voice of the individual pharmacist may reach the legislators, both state and national.[98]

A later editorial confirmed it:

> . . . the worst conditions prevail without exception in unorganized territory . . . . If you would improve conditions locally get together with your fellow druggist. If you have no local organization, start one, invite the other druggists of the community to meet with you . . . with a view to forming a local organization of retail druggists. Then

---

97. Samuel C. Henry, "State Pharmaceutical Associations," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 318, May 26, 1921.

98. Samuel C. Henry, "State Association Activities," N.A.R.D. Journal, 34: 85, April 20, 1922.

> write the N.A.R.D. office for information and advice relative to such local organizations and affiliation with the N.A.R.D.[99]

Eugene G. Eberle, editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, noted this "spirit of cooperation" in the N.A.R.D., and printed one of its convention resolutions to that effect. But Eberle also urged that "associations should become thoroughly acquainted with the opportunities afforded them by the House of Delegates of the American Pharmaceutical Association."[100] Eberle quoted Dr. James H. Beal's remark that the House of Delegates "is a real clearing house for pharmacy and afford the means whereby the state associations may, through their representatives, confer upon policies of common interest and also where the great national organizations of pharmacy may meet and coordinate their respective policies with each other and with the state societies."[101] House Chairman Robert L. Swain added, "The House of Delegates . . . constitutes a vital influence in pharmacy; its potential force is almost without limitation. It is the one place where state views

---

99. Samuel C. Henry, "Retail Trade Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 39: 302, November 13, 1924.

100. E. G. Eberle, "Association Meetings," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 311, April, 1931.

101. Ibid.

may be given a national expression."[102] Thus, perhaps unknowingly, the boundaries were set for the bitter conflict which was to take place thirty years later. However, it was Charles W. Parsons, editor of the American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, who put his finger on the real reason for the lack of support of state associations, even up to the early 1950's:

> One trouble with some of our State association secretaries is that they are busy retail druggists, with little stenographic assistance, and cannot spare the time nor have the conveniences for handling secretarial work and almost entirely such work is a labor of love. . . . There may be instances, though we know of none, where the association secretary receives pay sufficient to justify the demand that he render the service that should be expected of him. Until such happy condition be effected, the secretary's work will continue to be largely perfunctory.[103]

Little mention was made of state association activities during the early 1930's, except to mention that their support might relieve community pharmacists from "the unfair competition of predatory price cutting."[104] During the early 1940's, however, a rash of editorials came out in support of the state associations, notably in the pages of

---

102. Ibid., p. 312.

103. Charles W. Parsons(?), "There's a Reason," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 24, June, 1922.

104. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Activities of State Associations," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 49: 10, July, 1931.

Drug Topics, but usually merely stressed the importance of holding state conventions during the war years.[105] References to state association in any context--save that of federation with some national group--disappeared almost entirely from the editorial pages of the six journals under consideration during the last two eras sampled, with the exception of a keen observation made by Madeline Oxford Holland, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist. Holland brought her readers' attention to an editorial by J. Curtis Nottingham,* at that time secretary of the Virginia Pharmaceutical Association, in which he concluded that the voice of pharmacy rests with the state pharmaceutical associations. Holland also noted Nottingham's now-famous proposal--decidedly progressive at that time--that an integrated structure be set up whereby city, county, and state association members would automatically become members of each group and in turn members of the national group by the payment of one lump sum; each individual group would then be allotted a certain amount of these dues. It was Nottingham's belief that since all of the

---

105. Robert L. Swain, "New Jersey Sets Up a Label Bureau," Drug Topics, 56: 16, April 1, 1940; and "It Can Be Done!", Drug Topics, 87: 36, October 4, 1943; and "Kansas Did It!", Drug Topics, 87: 30, April 12, 1943; "We're For Them!", Drug Topics, 88: 34, February 7, 1944.

*J. Curtis Nottingham, "Who Speaks for Pharmacy?," Virginia Pharmacist, 37: 503 (1953).

state associations have representation in the A.Ph.A. House of Delegates, all of their members should be helping to pay the costs of the Association. Holland commented that "it will be interesting to follow the development and outcome of this proposal."[106] The proposal, of course, eventually resulted in the A.Ph.A.-state affiliation movement, in which Nottingham was to play so important a part nearly a decade later.

The early 1940's also gave rise to the formation of several new national pharmacy associations. The first of these, the American College of Apothecaries, was founded in 1940 and restricted its active membership to pharmacists operating "professional pharmacies."[107] A hardy young adult now, the College remains affiliated with its mother, the A.Ph.A., and membership in the latter is a prerequisite to becoming a Fellow. In its infancy, however, it was received with mixed emotions by the editors in our sample. John M. McDonnell, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, saw in its birth another evidence of the growing trend toward a greater appreciation of the professional phases of Pharmacy--a trend which in its earlier days brought

---

106. Madeline Oxford Holland, "State Associations," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 281, March, 1954.

107. "Conference of Professional Pharmacists," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 28: 938-939, November, 1939, cited by Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 188.

about the founding of the American Professional Pharmacist as the journal dedicated to these same purposes."[108] He enthused, "Such an organization has come but in answer to the need of changing times and trends," and continued,

> We believe and hope that the organization shall proceed, as we feel is demanded by the momentous impressiveness of the movement, in a slow, sure and conservative manner.[109]

John W. Dargavel, of the N.A.R.D. Journal, was not similarly impressed, however:

> One can only laud the ideals behind the movement on the part of a limited number of professionally-minded pharmacists to form a sort of guild, set apart by high restrictions, which would band them together. But it is obvious that the standards of pharmacy cannot be raised by forming a clique and barring from it by far the majority of the nation's pharmacists, who, by virtue of environment and the type of public service needed in their community, automatically would be eliminated from the group's membership list.
>
> . . . pharmacy as a profession cannot survive as a series of little groups in this day of super-organization. Unless pharmacy itself is well organized and is wholly and coordinatedly behind its organization, it will have difficulty in surviving the storms which assail it.[110]

---

108. John M. McDonnell, "Professional," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 287, May, 1940.

109. Ibid.

110. John W. Dargavel(?), "All for One...and One for All," N.A.R.D. Journal, 62: 671, May, 16, 1940.

The American Institute of the History of Pharmacy was organized at the University of Wisconsin two years later (1941). The Institute was able to carry out on a day-to-day basis the research, publication, and sociohistoric activities which the A.Ph.A. Section on Historical Pharmacy (f. 1904) meeting annually could not hope to accomplish. The slow but steady development of the Institute has been traced by Stieb,[111] but acknowledgement of its existence in our sample was not made until its tenth anniversary in the N.A.R.D. Journal.[112]

Sonnedecker tells us that until the 1920's, American hospital pharmacists had been a subordinate group in organization as well as in the institutions where they practiced.[113] In 1921, a "classic paper" by E. C. Austin,[114] pharmacist of the Cincinnati General Hospital, appeared in the Druggist's Circular, which spoke of the "appalling lack of well-trained hospital pharmacists and of the general apathy" of the profession toward this specialty.[113] Later in the same year, a series of twelve articles on hospital

---

111. Ernst W. Stieb, The American Institute of the History of Pharmacy--Through Two Decades (Madison, Wisconsin: American Institute of the History of Pharmacy, 1961).

112. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "A.I.H.P. Deserves Support," N.A.R.D. Journal, 73: 642, May 7, 1951.

113. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 189.

114. E. C. Austin, "Training Hospital Pharmacists," The Druggist's Circular, 65: 87, March, 1921, cited by Alex Berman, "The Formative Period: The Awakening in the Twenties," The Bulletin (of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists), 9: 288, July-August, 1952.

pharmacy appeared in the American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record,[115] submitted at the request of the editor, Charles W. Parsons, a contribution historian Alex Berman saw as "highly significant."[116]

In September, Parsons called his readers' attention to "a fast growing movement . . . to form a group of hospital pharmacists within the American Pharmaceutical Association for the purpose of interesting hospital pharmacists in the work of the Association, also to increase and improve the importance of the pharmacy departments in American hospitals."[117] Parsons modestly assumed that the movement had come about as a direct result of the twelve articles which appeared in his journal, although as Berman points out, this was not all of the story.[118] Promising to devote a column to hospital pharmacy in future issues, Parsons explained that,

> There is nothing defensive or offensive about this proposed action, and it seems worthy of the wholehearted support of all pharmacists as a constructive movement of the highest importance, one which if successfully carried out will have far reaching results in the future in raising the profession to higher and broader plains.[119]

---

115. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The Hospital Pharmacist," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 32, July, 1921; for papers see pp. 13-23.

116. Berman, loc. cit.

117. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Hospital Pharmacists in the A.Ph.A.," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 33, September, 1921.

118. Berman, op. cit., pp. 288-292.

119. Parsons, loc. cit.

The following month, Parsons reported that the A.Ph.A. did not establish a section solely devoted to the interests of hospital pharmacists, as had been requested, but rather included them in the Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing, which, to Parson's mind at least, seemed "a wise and satisfactory disposition of the matter, at least for the present."[120] A Sub-Section on Hospital Pharmacy was finally established as part of the Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing in 1936,[121] however, a mounting dissatisfaction with the organizational inadequacy of the Sub-Section set in as the hospital pharmacy movement began to grow.[122] This dissatisfaction culminated in the formation of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists during the 1942 meeting of the A.Ph.A. Like the American College of Apothecaries, the new Society made membership in the A.Ph.A. a prerequisite to membership, and continues as an affiliated organization.

Robert W. Rodman devoted an entire editorial to the new society in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, stating that "few pharmaceutical associations

---

120. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Hospital Pharmacists in the A.Ph.A.," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 34, October, 1921.

121. Alex Berman, "The Formative Period: The Advance In the Thirties," The Bulletin (of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists), 9: 293-298, July-August, 1952.

122. L. C. Zopf, "Hospital Pharmacy's Place," American Professional Pharmacist, 3: 24, April, 1937, cited by Berman, ibid., p. 295.

have been organized with greater opportunities for good."[123]

N.A.R.D.'s Dargavel, however, was pessimistic:

> One can only praise . . . the ideals of the ideals of the hospital pharmacists who wish to raise their professional status. But they serve only a relatively small percentage of those persons needing pharmaceutical services throughout the nation.
>
> .....
>
> For all pharmacists to unite to protect the interest and welfare of all is highly desirable. To form, within such organizations, units for the study of special problems, is valuable. But to try to break up into small units, each claiming to be the true representatives of the "better class" in the profession, is not serving the profession advantageously, however much enthusiasm may be generated.[124]

The splintering effect within the American Pharmaceutical Association caused by the formation of these and other national pharmaceutical organizations was to cause a profound effect on any federation movement in pharmacy, as we shall see.

The Federation Movement in Pharmacy

That the profession of pharmacy in the United States has never been able to "get together" on a continuing, coordinating, and cooperative basis, except during temporary

---

123. Robert W. Rodman, "Hospital Pharmacists Organize," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 64, March, 1943.

124. Dargavel, loc. cit.

crises now and then, remains an intriguing mystery. An eager sociologist might wish to ascribe this organizational hiatus to the traditional entrepreneurial attitude characteristic of the community practice of pharmacy in America, in which only distance distinguishes a "fellow pharmacist" from a "cut-throat competitor," yet the explanation undoubtedly lies deeper.

Although a progressive and far-reaching step had been taken in 1912 with the formation of the American Pharmaceutical Association's House of Delegates,[125] this cannot be taken as an example of federation (except, perhaps, in an Orwellian sense) although, as will be noted, it has been used as an editorial cudgel to promote federation throughout the years covered by this study.

The first attempt at achieving federation among several national pharmaceutical associations on a co-equal basis, however, occurred the following year. The National Drug Trade Conference was organized in 1913 with the objective of "providing a common meeting ground where all elements of the profession might make frank expression of their views on all matters germane to pharmacy and the drug trade."[126]

---

125. "Resolution Creating A House of Delegates and Defining its Functions and Duties," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 928, September, 1912.

126. Edward C. Elliott, The General Report of the Pharmaceutical Survey (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950), p. 51.

The Conference presently consists of the American Pharmaceutical Association (A.Ph.A.), the National Association of Retail Druggists (N.A.R.D.), and seven other national organizations of varying scope.* Each organization is represented by three delegates, one of which serves as a member of the executive committee, which approves subjects to be presented at an annual meeting for deliberation. No vote is taken by the Conference unless two-thirds of the affiliated associations are in attendance, and resolutions declaring the policy of the Conference require an unanimous vote.[127] The unit rule of procedure, adopted in 1926, more than anything else, prevented the Conference from serving as the agency for the unification of professional policy and action, although it has achieved limited success in the legislative arena and was responsible for the formation of the American Foundation for Pharmaceutical Education in 1942.[128]

---

*American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, Federal Wholesale Druggists' Association, National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, National Association of Chain Drug Stores, National Wholesale Druggists' Association, Proprietary Association, and Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association.

127. Ibid.

128. Ibid., pp. 51-52.

Perhaps the novelty of the venture more than anything else elicited kind remarks in the editorial pages of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the N.A.R.D. Journal during the early 1920's and early 1930's, for little editorial mention of the Conference was found in succeeding eras. Eugene G. Eberle, editor of the A.Ph.A. Journal, commented that "coordinated effort is becoming a greater force and is an essential organizational quality."[129] Samuel C. Henry, editor of the N.A.R.D. Journal, and, interestingly enough, president of the Council (1922-23), held the opposite point of view:

> Numerous suggestions and several well thought out plans have in recent years been brought forward, looking to the amalgamation of the several drug organization under one head. The Journal has consistently held to the view that such procedure was neither timely nor wise . . . . the real purpose of the proponents of such plans could best be accomplished by the continuance of the several organizations . . . through the instrumentality of the National Drug Trade Conference . . . resulting in the accomplishment of the greatest good without fear of disrupting or destroying any of the constituent elements.[130]

Henry might have been soured by the preeminence of the A.Ph.A. in the formation of the Conference, however.[131]

---

129. E. G. Eberle, "The National Drug Trade Conference," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 7, January, 1923.

130. Samuel C. Henry, "The National Drug Trade Conference," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 486, December 14, 1922.

131. E. G. Eberle, "Influences That Promote Endeavor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 6-7, January, 1932.

The far-reaching Pharmaceutical Survey (1946-49) observed the wide range of professional and commercial associations by which American pharmacy was represented at mid-century and reported that "their aims and activities are uncoordinated, ofttimes in conflict and therefore tend to produce a low rate of and quantity of professional accomplishment."[132] The Survey concluded that,

> there is both opportunity and need for better coordination of the organized efforts and more effective channeling of the professional power. Unity of purpose requires a unified utilization of power. This requirement pharmacy has not yet met.[133]

Nearly two decades later, pharmacy had not yet met the requirement. In observing the organizational structures of other health professions, particularly medicine and dentistry, and their inherent political and socio-economic power, one cannot help but be struck by the myopia peculiar to organized pharmacy. What the various associations which claim to represent the profession (or business) of pharmacy have done in the last half-century to join together to form a common bond with a common goal is more or less a matter of record; what should be done in the future to accomplish this objective is somewhat presumptive and beyond the scope of this study. Why the associations acted

---

132. Elliott, op. cit., p. 39.

133. Ibid.

as they did, however, is another story. In this section we shall compare and contrast the thoughts of our journal editors on the general topic of pharmaceutical federation and (albeit with the cold, clear light of hindsight) attempt to indicate a path of least resistance beyond the "cross-roads" which the profession of pharmacy has been trying to cross for so many years.

Editorial concern with the federation movement in pharmacy during the early 1920's centered primarily about the proposed reorganization of the A.Ph.A. House of Delegates, which would have all members of the state associations being members of the A.Ph.A., governed by the House of Delegates itself made up of representatives of the state associations, which would concern itself with "everything pharmaceutical--a compact, virile organization of all classes of pharmacy, representing American pharmacy nationally and within the states."[134] A.Ph.A. Journal editor Eberle went on to say that,

> It is the general practice among sciences, professions and vocations to have a national organization embracing in its membership all classes, and, in addition, divisional organizations affiliated with the national body to represent each class of membership in matters of interest to that particular class only.[135]

---

134. E. G. Eberle, "Extending the Service of the House of Delegates," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 730-731, October, 1921.

135. Ibid., p. 731.

Within another six months, the Iowa and Minnesota associations had voted favorably for affiliation and pledged their support to the reorganization movement;[136] then thereafter, however, the ensuing debate about the merits of the plan in the pages of the Journal and other contemporary publications prompted Eberle to withdraw his editorial prerogative temporarily and to impartially publish both views on the question.[137]

It is understandable, therefore, that the August, 1922 meeting of the A.Ph.A. was described as "peppy;" it is also understandable that most of the members of the executive committee of the N.A.R.D. were present.[138] In a guest editorial, E. F. Kelly discussed the salient points of the compromise measure which was finally passed unanimously by the A.Ph.A. Council. The original plan had stated that only those state associations 51 per cent of whose active members were also members of the A.Ph.A. could be represented in the House of Delegates; this requirement was deemed impractical, if not impossible. Consequently, a compromise plan was adopted which would become effective when twenty state

---

136. E. G. Eberle, "Reorganization of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 244, April, 1922.

137. E. G. Eberle, "Reorganization of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 608, June, 1922.

138. H. V. Arny, "The Cleveland Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 663, September, 1922.

associations, not less than 10 per cent of whose members held membership in the A.Ph.A., gave notice of their acceptance of it. The state associations approving the plan were given five years to increase their A.Ph.A. membership to the 51 per cent level mentioned above on pain of losing their voting privileges. This progressive move on the part of the A.Ph.A. transformed the House of Delegates--which had really been functioning as a glorified committee on resolutions--into a potent factor in the work and activities of the Association. As Kelly put it, "the dream of one representative control organization to act as a clearing house for all the truly pharmaceutical organizations of America has a chance to become a reality."[139] He continued:

> . . . the A.Ph.A. will be greatly strengthened in representative membership and will be in the position to more nearly serve the purpose for which it was originally intended; that is, to represent, as far as is helpful, American pharmacy in its entirety. The state and divisional organizations will be, to an extent at least, federated, and will have the opportunity to come into that close contact and cooperation . . . without losing their individuality or being hampered in their separate activities.
>
> . . . the era of pharmaceutical organization in the true and, therefore, cooperative sense of the word has just begun.[140]

---

139. E. F. Kelly, "Readjustment of A.Ph.A. Activities for Better and Greater Service of American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 665-666, September, 1922.

140. Ibid., p. 666.

Indeed, a resolution was adopted endorsing an annual joint session of the executive committees of the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D. to be held alternately at the annual meetings of these associations, and the billets-doux between the two were also published in the A.Ph.A. Journal.[141]

Reginald E. Dyer, editor of The Practical Druggist, urged the state associations to "approve these plans for a real national federation of pharmacy,"[142] but what had really been accomplished? If we can take contemporary editorials in the N.A.R.D. Journal as an indication of the tenor of that worthy organization, not much. Editor Henry had already come out opposed to "any attempt on the part of the A.Ph.A. to duplicate the work now being carried on by other highly developed bodies,"[143] and just prior to the 1922 A.Ph.A. meeting he wrote that,

> . . . no real friend of pharmacy will do ought to weaken or destroy any of those . . . organizations which . . . are functioning in defense of a common cause.

---

141. Ambrose Hunsberger, "Constructive Efforts in Behalf of American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 666-667, September, 1922; E. G. Eberle, "Coordinated Endeavor of Pharmaceutical Associations," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 667-668, September, 1922.

142. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "To More Thoroughly Organize American Pharmacy," The Practical Druggist, 41: 15, April, 1923.

143. Samuel C. Henry, "What's the Answer?," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 834, August 25, 1921.

> . . . each of the various pharmaceutical bodies functioning has its own particular sphere of usefulness and each should be sustained and upheld by those whom it serves.[144]

The change in attitude after the meeting was not overwhelming:

> . . . we must maintain and strengthen our several organizations . . . . We must not . . . allow narrow and selfish views to govern our actions . . . . anything that causes injury to pharmacy must of necessity be harmful to the general public and vice versa. Such is the policy of the N.A.R.D. and along these lines we will continue functioning in the interest of pharmacy and the public . . . .[145]

Meanwhile, Charles W. Parsons, editor of the American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, who, in agreeing with a correspondent who wrote that New York pharmacy was "largely in the hands of a lot of Russian and Polish Bolshevics without conscience or character," wrote that he had "discovered" that "to the lack of suitable organization may be attributed the majority, if not all of the ills which pharmacy is now suffering."[146] In another editorial

---

144. Samuel C. Henry, "Organized Pharmacy Progressing," N.A.R.D. Journal, 34: 49, April 12, 1922.

145. Samuel C. Henry, "Fair Play," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 438, December 7, 1922.

146. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Organization the Remedy," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 32, March, 1922.

Parsons emphasized the need for a "complete organization of pharmacy," adding that "until such organization is official little real progress and advancement by our law makers and by the public can be logically expected."[147]

Turning his eyes westward, Parsons later reported that the N.A.R.D. had expressed some fear of what had become known as the "Kansas Plan." In brief, the Plan merely provided that the state association would tell manufacturers what it considered fair business methods and then report the attitudes of the various manufacturers back to the membership; however, the N.A.R.D. felt that this form of organization would react against and lessen its own efficacy. Even Parsons, who could generally be counted upon to turn a complimentary phrase where the N.A.R.D. was concerned, had to shake his head:

> For the life of us we cannot find any justification for such concern. A state well organized in itself is a better and stronger member of any national organization of which it is a part . . . . What is the N.A.R.D. anyway but a combination of units?
> .....
> We can find in this nothing inimical to the N.A.R.D.; rather the contrary. Strengthen any member and the body is strengthened. The A.Ph.A. is reorganizing along line whereby professional pharmacy may be better conserved and

---

147. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Drug Stores Not Well Represented in Organizations," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 31, March, 1922.

> furthered; possibly the N.A.R.D. would benefit by a little reorganization.[148]

The following month, Parsons could report that the Kansas Plan was gaining strength and support, especially in the western states,[149] the N.A.R.D., if not running scared, was at least wringing its hands.

The very real economic pressure caused by the depression in the early 1930's precluded much discussion of pharmaceutical federation, as we have seen. The A.Ph.A. was growing in strength; the N.A.R.D. had survived an era of poor management, and with a new lobbying office in Washington, was surging ahead, hobbled as it still was by a resolution-based organizational structure which could only continue whereasing government and business.

The N.A.R.D. Journal reported that the joint meetings between the executive committee of the N.A.R.D. and the Council of the A.Ph.A. continued to be cordial, and that the N.A.R.D. officers planned to go "further than ever before" in their efforts to bring about a closer working arrangement between the two organizations.[150] In one of

---

148. Charles W. Parsons(?), "N.A.R.D. Fears 'Kansas Plan'," American Druggist, 71: 32, November, 1923.

149. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The 'Plan' Grows in Strength," American Druggist, 71: 45, December, 1923.

150. George A. Bender(?), "N.A.R.D. and A.Ph.A.," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 848, August 16, 1934.

the last numbers of The Practical Druggist and Spatula, editor Dyer reprinted an editorial from the New Jersey Journal of Pharmacy which called for a merger of the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D., the former association assuming the leadership, the latter to remain as the "Commercial Section;" a merger, however, was summarily rejected by the N.A.R.D. at its 1934 convention.[151]

The strife-torn early 1940's, however, produced a most promising approach toward maintaining effective communication, coordination, and division of labor or function between the two associations. Prompted by a request from the Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries, negotiations led by executive secretaries E. F. Kelly (A.Ph.A.) and John W. Dargavel (N.A.R.D.) culminated at a combined meeting of their executive boards in 1943.[152] The objectives of the meeting, as set forth in the resolution adopted at the Columbus meeting the year before were for the purpose of

> . . . surveying and studying the resolutions adopted by the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D., and by the state and local pharmaceutical associations during the year; and for a competent study of mutual problems of recognized importance and significance, and for the purpose of each

---

151. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Let Us Talk Sense," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 52: 27, November, 1934.

152. Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 189.

> group dealing with these matters as circumstances may indicate.[153]

The report on the historic conference indicated the wide gamut of resolutions and problems that were discussed,[154] and the enthusiastic reception which it received from the pens of our chosen editors hinted that they felt that perhaps a new era in pharmacy had indeed been reached. Dr. Robert L. Swain, editor of Drug Topics, called the meeting "a splendid example of intelligent teamwork," and stated that,

> For once, pharmacy has decided fully to utilize its organizational resources as a means to pharmaceutical betterment. For once, pharmacy has caught up with the true meaning of unity of thought and action as essential ingredients in pharmaceutical planning.
>
> The Washington meeting . . . affords the opportunity not only for the exchange of opinions, but for the very kind of progress which can only come from that give-and-take attitude which finally brushes petty differences aside for the larger interests of the profession as a whole.[155]

---

153. E. F. Kelly and John W. Dargavel, "Report on Historic A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D. Conference," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 394, December, 1943.

154. Ibid., pp. 394-399.

155. Robert L. Swain, "History Making!," Drug Topics, 87: 20, December 27, 1943.

Editor John N. McDonnell, of the American Professional Pharmacist, agreed that the conference was "long overdue, and imperative for the continued existence of real Pharmacy,"[156] and John W. McPherrin of the American Druggist wrote that Kelly and Dargavel proved that "the true spirit of unity is more important than the mechanics of it."[157]

The editors of the associations' journals, however, took a more realistic view of what had transpired. "Not 'one voice for pharmacy'," as A.Ph.A. Journal's Glenn Sonnedecker put it, "but a harmonious duet came out of the historic conference."[158] Sonnedecker continued:

> . . . the two associations seem to have a greater mutual understanding of the pharmaceutical problems in their respective fields than many have been willing to admit.
>
> There has been talk before about A.Ph.A. and N.A.R.D. getting closer together, but the conference just held is the first time that a practical joint stand on so many common problems has been worked out. It should not be imagined that both groups suddenly see eye to eye on every point.
>
> .....
>
> From here it looks as though the business and professional phases of pharmacy can

---

156. John N. McDonnell(?), "Random Thoughts," American Professional Pharmacist, 9: 785, December, 1943.

157. John W. McPherrin, "Add...'For the Dignity of Pharmacy'," American Druggist, 108: 43, October, 1943.

158. Glenn Sonnedecker, "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 4: 374, December, 1943.

> be conducted side by side on a national scale just as effectively as many pharmacists have done in their home towns.[159]

N.A.R.D.'s John W. Dargavel, who had reported there had been some misgiving or reluctance among some of the delegates to attend the conference, cautioned that the success of the meeting would depend upon "the sincerity of the men who make up the executive body, and second, on the support given them by the druggists of the nation."[160] Later on, however, he came back to the party line:

> It would be impossible to work out a plan that would more closely integrate the two associations, short of an organic union which would mean, virtually, that one or the other of them would pass out of existence . . . .
> .....
> If all these clashing interests were united in one association for the purposes of protecting and advancing their economic interests, there could never be harmony in pharmacy.
>
> There is one field in which these groups can get along together, and only one, and that is the purely professional field . . . .
>
> . . . practical men in the drug industry reject the suggestion that we scrap coordination and substitute a system of unified chaos.

---

159. Ibid., pp. 374-375.

160. John W. Dargavel(?), "Forging Ahead in '44," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 19, January 3, 1944.

> As we need separate associations to speak for the professional and the economic interests of pharmacy, so do we need state and local as well as national associations . . . . The important thing is that all these groups work together toward common ends and not at cross purposes.[161]

The following year, "plans were made to coordinate future activities of the two organizations in meeting the developing problems of American pharmacy," and to further this objective, a continuing joint committee was named to function between the joint conferences; moreover, cross representation was provided on six key committees of the two associations.[162] This second meeting was praised on the editorial pages of Drug Topics,[163] but other editorials presumably passed the scope of our sample.

Sonnedecker relates that this productive mechanism disintegrated by the 1950's for a complex of reasons, including disagreement on legislative issues (Durham-Humphrey bill), overlapping functions, personal incompatibilities, and a question of primacy between professional and commercial values among practitioners.[164] The General Report of

---

161. John W. Dargavel, "To Live and Help to Live," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 1391, August 21, 1944.

162. "Second Annual A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D. Conference," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 6: 13, January, 1945.

163. Robert L. Swain, "Timely Teamwork!," Drug Topics, 88: 36, November 13, 1944.

164. Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 189.

the Pharmaceutical Survey 1946-49, published at that time accumulated evidence indicative of the handicaps for the professional unity and progress of pharmacy "due to the absence of any one agency to speak and to act upon matters of fundamental policy," dismissing the A.Ph.A. because of its small size and the N.A.R.D. because of its "dominating interest in pharmacy as a commercial enterprise rather than as a professional undertaking."[165]

During the late 1940's, a debate had begun between the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D. on the problems of federal restrictions on the renewal of prescriptions. The A.Ph.A. asked for a ruling by the Federal Security Agency on the interpretation of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the filling and refilling of prescriptions, which the N.A.R.D. interpreted as a delay action strategy to prevent the passage of any further legislation. To expedite matters, therefore, the N.A.R.D. decided to go ahead with a separate and independent effort, which the A.Ph.A. construed as a bid for organizational primacy. The A.Ph.A. then decided to bring a lawsuit against the Federal Security Agency to bring about clarification of the authority centered in the Food and Drug Administration, telling the pharmacists that the outcome would deliver them from the nuisance of federal restrictions on prescriptions; the N.A.R.D. viewed the entire procedure as clear evidence that the A.Ph.A. was

---

165. Elliott, loc. cit.

aligning itself with the pharmaceutical industry--which naturally wished to retain control of the legend--and that it was trying to prevent a solution from emanating from the N.A.R.D.

In any event, by the time our sampling procedure had picked up the proceedings (1950), the two associations were at it hammer and tong. Vitriol and vituperation simply flowed from Dargavel's pen in messages with such titles as "Misguided and Weasel Opposition," "Obstructive Confusion Compounded," and "Fischelis of the A.Ph.A. Aligns Himself With Manufacturers Against N.A.R.D. Bill."[166] The editorials themselves, strangely enough, were silent on the matter, when they appeared. Fischelis, who was at that time editor of the A.Ph.A. Journal, replied in as dignified a tone as he could muster in an editorial titled "Remember the Declaration of Independence":

> The American Pharmaceutical Association has stood by the principle that regulation of the professions is a state and not a federal function; that the Congress does not intend to regulate prescription practice at the federal level; and that the American way to determine what a law means is to have the Administrative Agency designated to enforce the law, state officially what it means . . . .

---

166. John W. Dargavel, "Misguided and Weasel Opposition," N.A.R.D. Journal, 72: 1499, October 2, 1950; "Obstructive Confusion Compounded," N.A.R.D. Journal, 72: 1835, November 20, 1950; "Fischelis of the A.Ph.A. Aligns Himself With Manufacturers Against N.A.R.D. Bill," N.A.R.D. Journal, 73: 808, 826, 830, 832, 834, 836, June 4, 1951, cited by Sonnedecker, loc. cit., p. 82.

> The Food and Drug Administration and the N.A.R.D. together forcefully opposed this American procedure. They recognized the inadequacy of the FDA interpretation of the law with respect to prescription filling but insist that amendment of the law is the only remedy.[167]

Madeline Oxford Holland, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, suggested that "the leaders of organized pharmacy should have attempted to work out some mutually satisfactory arrangement and not have allowed such a furor to develop," adding,

> Those who presumably direct the policies of our pharmaceutical organizations have a responsibility to their membership which should transcend their personal wishes to follow their own dictates. A few more incidents such as this may well make us appear ridiculous in the eyes of other groups wherein such folly is unthinkable.[168]

Dr. Linwood F. Tice, editor of the American Journal of Pharmacy, called the heated disagreement "unfortunate and tragic."

> . . . Where, indeed, is the "united front" for pharmacy about which we heard so much a few years back? When was the last joint meeting held of the Council of the A.Ph.A. and the Executive

---

167. Robert P. Fischelis, "Remember the Declaration of Independence," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 12: 402, July, 1951.

168. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Canada Views the Refill Controversy," American Professional Pharmacist, 17: 425, May, 1951.

> Committee of the N.A.R.D.? What has happened to the joint resolution which we once had setting forth a coordinated program for pharmacy in the United States? . . .
>
> Little will be gained and much damage done as long as one organization attempts to justify its departure from cooperation and coordinating by questioning the motivation of the other and suggesting that it does not have the true interests of pharmacists at heart . . . .
>
> . . . as long as the two organizations are at loggerheads . . . nothing concrete of value to pharmacy can be accomplished.
>
> . . . Each organization serves a certain distinct area of pharmacy but there are areas of activity and interest which must perforce overlap. It is here that close cooperation and joint action must be taken if the broad interests of pharmacy are to be protected and improved.
>
> . . . All differences could be settled if just a few key men would swallow a little pride, sit down amicably and each make a few concessions . . . .
>
> . . . The truly great find it possible to forgive and forget. Shall men in high places find it impossible?[169]

A year later, however--after the passage of the Durham-Humphrey amendments--Fischelis was still regretting that the N.A.R.D. "could not find its way clear to avoid a course of actions which relied exclusively on new legislation to solve the prescription regulation problem," and still

---

169. L. F. Tice, "A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D. Controversy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 122: 406-407, November, 1950.

believed that "the legislation was unnecessary," but concluded that since it was now in the books, "we shall do our best to aid in making it workable, but without surrendering the right to recommend changes."[170]

By 1953, the dispute had grown to include such points as the length of the pharmacy curriculum, who should maintain FDA contact, and who really accomplished the exemption of prescription files from inspection. Holland observed that "it appears that the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D. are now further apart than ever before," and stated:

> We cannot help but decry this widening of the rift for surely no one in Pharmacy will benefit by it. Pharmacy needs now, more than ever, to solidify its professional standing because the public is becoming more and more conscious of the so-called increased costs of medical care and the blame generally is laid upon the pharmacist's shoulders because of expensive prescriptions. . . . If Pharmacy were to present a united front to the public and to the other professions many of its greatest problems would be solved. . . .
>
> Have things actually gone so far that it is impossible for the officers of both organizations to meet at the conference table?[171]

Half the answer to her question came with a resolution passed at the Boston Convention of the A.Ph.A. in August, 1954, in which the A.Ph.A. reiterated its willingness "to

---

170. Robert P. Fischelis, "Let Us Not Surrender Our Professional Freedom," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 97, February, 1952.

171. Madeline Oxford Holland, "A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 895, November, 1953.

meet with the executive bodies of other national organizations at any time for the purpose of conferring on the coordination of efforts in behalf of the profession of pharmacy."[172]

By the early 1960's, however, a fresh breeze was blowing, and one could sense the very presence of federation in the air. The first state association to take a deep breath of the heady stuff was that of Pennsylvania, which resolved to move toward unification with the A.Ph.A. (reciprocal membership) and with each county association in the state, and its efforts were lauded by both Tice and Holland.[173] The A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D. were revitalized, too, each by a new executive secretary, William S. Apple (1960) and Willard B. Simmons (1961), respectively. One might have supposed that this new leadership would be free of personality conflicts, preconceived notions, and just plain stubbornness, but such was not the case.

To Tice, at least, Dargavel's death signalled a new era in organizational cooperation. Tice contrasted the

---

172. Robert P. Fischelis, "Cooperation," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 15: 754, December, 1954.

173. L. F. Tice, "An Example for Others," American Journal of Pharmacy, 132: 250-251, July, 1960; Madeline Oxford Holland, "Unified Organization," American Professional Pharmacist, 26: 485, August, 1960.

"diminishing purpose and program of the N.A.R.D.," with the "enlivened, energetic, and revitalized A.Ph.A.," and stated that the cause celebre of fair trade had "just about been exhausted," adding,

> . . . retail pharmacists are beginning to have lurking doubts whether their key to survival really lies solely in efforts to protect the small businessman. . . . The more enlightened of pharmacy's retailers have already sensed that professional status is their only hope . . . . So, too, has there been increasing recognition that the A.Ph.A. is the real champion of the profession and its only hope of organized effort to protect such status.
>
> While the N.A.R.D. continues to be of service to the owners of retail pharmacies, it should not and must not be permitted to obstruct the program of the A.Ph.A. for all pharmacists.
>
> . . . The N.A.R.D. should return home to the A.Ph.A. from which it never should have parted. Only as an affiliate of the A.Ph.A. can united, effective action be accomplished . . . yet its identity and relative autonomy could still be preserved. The next step would be the development of an integrated county, state, and national professional organization which is our most crying need.[174]

Tice was taken to task by Morris E. Blatman, secretary of the Philadelphia Association of Retail Druggists, in the

---

174. L. F. Tice, "Now Is The Hour," American Journal of Pharmacy, 133: 348-349, October, 1961.

January, 1962 issue of the P.A.R.D. Bulletin, which was reprinted in full in the February N.A.R.D. Journal by editor Peter J. Sletterdahl, who accused Tice of being misinformed concerning the history and purpose of the N.A.R.D.[175] The tirade is puerile, and need not be quoted, but the action is significant, and should be noted.

In another corner, George B. Griffenhagen, newly-appointed editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, discussed the organizational structure of the American Medical Association (AMA), and pointed out that a similar structure in pharmacy "would result in inestimable potential strength" and promised "to exert all possible effort to attain such a goal."[176] Dan Rennick, editor of the American Druggist, elaborated upon the simile. Rennick pointed out that although a physician must become a member of the AMA in order to be admitted into his state or county group, that no national medical organizations were similarly affiliated with AMA--a point that Griffenhagen had apparently neglected to make. Rennick concluded that "AMA is not the all-inclusive group of formal associations that we may have supposed. If the American Pharmaceutical Association is indeed following the AMA pattern then it really should

---

175. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "Blatman Undertakes To Enlighten Dean Tice," N.A.R.D. Journal, 84: 20, 53, March 5, 1962.

176. George B. Griffenhagen, "Too Many Organizations,... or Too Little Organization?," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 11, January, 1962.

not insist that the NARD belongs under its umbrella."[177] In a subsequent editorial, Rennick remarked that federation with the A.Ph.A. would "probably not" be deleterious to pharmacy if the A.Ph.A. truly functioned as the voice of the individual pharmacists practicing among the grass roots. The big problem, as Rennick saw it, was that an association representing all pharmacists cannot properly represent the basic interest of the people who own and operate pharmacies. Rennick strongly urged all pharmacists--whether employed or self-employed--to join the A.Ph.A. "so that it may indeed function as the voice of professional pharmacy in America;" he also urged all pharmacy owners to become active members in the N.A.R.D., for "only the NARD can be expected to battle for the economic considerations without which no enterprise can survive."[178] But Rennick raised an interesting point in concluding:

> When a state association affiliates with APhA, it becomes an organization of individuals and must, perforce, deal with the problems of the individual pharmacist rather than with those of the store owner.

---

177. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: Guardians of the Rank & File (3)," American Druggist, 148: 10, December 9, 1963.

178. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: Guardians of the Rank & File (4)," American Druggist, 148: 10, December 23, 1963.

> The NARD, thus, is left with no other choice than to encourage the establishment of a second state group--devoted entirely to the needs and wishes of store owners.[179]

Rennick's fear of a bipartite state-national organizational structure in pharmacy did not come to pass; however, by the end of 1963 several states had affiliated with the A.Ph.A., and many others were considering the move. It seemed clear at this point that neither the A.Ph.A. nor the N.A.R.D. would--or could--engulf the other, for as we have seen, the A.Ph.A. had modified its active membership to include only registered pharmacists (effectively excluding non-pharmacist store owners), and the N.A.R.D. had for some time restricted its active membership to pharmacy owners, whether or not they were registered pharmacists. Apparently realizing this, Tice reversed his stand--partially:

> There is no reason why the National Association of Retail Druggists and the American Pharmaceutical Association cannot live together in a spirit of friendly cooperation, but any claim on the part of the NARD that it represents the profession of pharmacy is unacceptable since it does not and cannot. In its efforts to do so, the NARD often complicates what might otherwise be an effective approach in finding a solution to problems which presently are of serious proportions.[180]

---

179. Ibid.

180. L. F. Tice, "Another Step Forward," American Journal of Pharmacy, 135: 277, August, 1963.

The problem of affiliation with the A.Ph.A. had reached serious proportions, at least as far as the N.A.R.D. was concerned. During his year as N.A.R.D. president (1963-64), Frank Lobraico made dozens of impassioned speeches opposing the affiliation movement, many of which were published as portions of editorials in the N.A.R.D. Journal:

> Federation deprives the individual practitioner of pharmacy of the freedom to join the state association alone. It is compulsory for him to belong to the A.Ph.A.
>
> Furthermore, . . . federation delivers control of the state association to the employee pharmacists. They outnumber the drug store owners and hence they will be in a position to outvote the drug store owners on every issue they choose to support or to oppose . . . .
>
> . . . federation will make it necessary for the drug store owners to form another state association composed of only drug store owners and such is the deplorable situation in each state that is now in federation with the A.Ph.A.
> .....
> The N.A.R.D. has no desire whatsoever to control the local and state pharmaceutical organizations.181

By the end of 1964, relations between the two associations had deteriorated to such an extent that when Executive Secretary James D. Hawkins of the newly-affiliated Indiana Pharmaceutical Association protested the "abusive" editorial

---

181. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "Brennan Praises Lobraico on 'Federation'," N.A.R.D. Journal, 85: 13, July 1, 1963.

coverage his convention received in the N.A.R.D. Journal, editor Sletterdahl, with an unaccustomed martial ring in his editorial voice, denounced Hawkins and expanded his original comments.[182] A.Ph.A. Journal editor Griffenhagen pointed to the fundamental philosophical difference between the two organizations:

> NARD says that commercialism poses no barrier to high standards and that just about any "upfront merchandise" is good for the "independent retail druggist" as long as it "turns a profit." APhA says that we are striving for a professional environment and for a practice in which professional services can provide the economic basis for the existence of pharmacy.
>
> Take but one example . . . . NARD has resolved that a class of non-prescription drugs be sold only in pharmacies, but APhA subscribes to the position that there should be a class of drugs for self-treatment which are available personally from a pharmacist. The NARD approach would apparently be to merchandise more non-prescription drugs using the results of NARD-Proprietary Association partnership to increase OTC business. The APhA approach would be to make the pharmacist the recognized professional health consultant to the public at the point of purchase of non-prescription drugs.
>
> Unfortunately the symptoms of such disputes have often masked the condition itself and seldom has the very basic philosophy been bared for the pharmacists to make the decision as to which is best for the profession.

---

182. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "N.A.R.D. Editor 'Teaches' Hawkins of I.Ph.A.," N.A.R.D. Journal, 86: 20-21, 71, September 7, 1964.

> The choice between these basic philosophies is yours . . . .[183]

A spokesman for the N.A.R.D. explained to those attending the A.Ph.A. annual meeting in 1899 that N.A.R.D. was formed because "our commercial interests are becoming superior to our professional interests;"[184] the cycle by 1964 had been completed. What were the prospects for cooperation in the future? Some felt the answer lay in the formation of another organization, an all-pharmacy council.

As far back as 1935, Samuel C. Henry, past-secretary of the N.A.R.D., had declared: "The time is at hand for the creation of an advisory board or commission so constituted as to be truly representative of all branches of [pharmacy]."[185] In 1943, Dallas L. Bruner, who subsequently became secretary of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association, wrote: "The crying need of Pharmacy today is for a unified Council of Pharmacy--a supreme council of all retail associations that will produce one voice for Pharmacy on common problems."[186] Dr. Robert L. Swain, editor of Drug Topics,

---

183. George B. Griffenhagen, "The Courage of Making a Choice," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS3: 557, November, 1963.

184. "Remarks of S. N. Jones from the N.A.R.D.," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 47 (1899), p. 14, quoted by Griffenhagen, ibid.

185. Samuel C. Henry, "Sam Henry Says," American Druggist, 92: 74, September, 1935, quoted by Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: A Charter for Pharmacy's Supreme Court," American Druggist, 150: 5, August 3, 1964.

186. Quoted by Dan Rennick, ibid.

commented favorably on Bruner's proposal: "We need to outgrow the jurisdictional squabbles which tend to boil up now and then between our great national organizations and devise some means whereby we can unite under the banner of all for one and one for all."[187] That same year, the Bernays Drug and Pharmaceutical Survey was completed, and among the recommendations made by Edward L. Bernays, head of the public relations agency conducting the survey, was the following: "Pharmacy's lack of a united public relations front before Washington and the state governments [is a serious problem]. With many divergent views coming in from the various factors in the industry and profession, the picture these governments get is often confused."[188]

The General Report of the Pharmaceutical Survey 1946-49 came to much the same conclusion, when it cautiously suggested that:

> It may be that the triple character of pharmacy in operation--as a profession, as a massive manufacturing enterprise, and as one of the many forms of retail merchandising--makes it impossible to effect an organization through which there would be coordinated action for the betterment of the whole of pharmacy. Such an organization may be considered as a prime requisite for mobilizing the profession for progress.[189]

---

187. Robert L. Swain, "Your Pharmacy and Mine: Everlastingly First," Drug Topics, 87: 9, May 10, 1943, quoted by Dan Rennick, ibid.

188. Bernays, op. cit., p. 372.

189. Elliott, loc. cit.

(It is significant to mention, however, that a proposal for the organization of a Federated Assembly of the Representatives of Pharmaceutical Associations presented to the Committee on the Pharmaceutical Survey did not receive favorable consideration.)[190] Finally, by 1964, others were echoing the plea: Howard Schwartz, supreme councilor of Rho Pi Phi Pharmaceutical Fraternity, wrote his membership, "Formation of a United Pharmacy Council as the unified, one voice of Pharmacy, is strongly indicated.. . . Rho Pi Phi is in a position to act as a catalyst in forming the council since its membership crosses all state lines, all branches of the profession, all political groups and national pharmaceutical organizations."[191] Last, but not least, Nicholas Gesoalde, long-time secretary of the Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York, proposed that the National Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries serve as an arbitrator in settling differences between the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D.[192]

It is not surprising, therefore, to find Dan Rennick proposing much the same thing:

---

190. Ibid., n. 8.

191. Quoted by Dan Rennick, op. cit.

192. Quoted by Dan Rennick, op. cit.

> . . . if a solid front cannot be achieved via either the APhA or the NARD, it can still be accomplished through the creation of an All-Pharmacy Council, composed of delegates from every organization with roots in community pharmacy.
> .....
> A super council, such as I envision, would not only constitute Pharmacy's single voice as far as the public is concerned; it would also be the instrument whereby disputes between Pharmacy's organizations would be adjudicated on a completely democratic basis.[193]

Rennick also listed the organizations which he felt would make up such a council,[194] and in a subsequent editorial drew up a proposed charter for the organization, based on the charter of the United Nations with respect to voting procedures and the structure of the United States Congress with respect to membership.[195]

The above advice, counsel, study, and recommendations have so far gone by unheeded; yet the crystallization of progressive precepts leading to the goal of one voice for pharmacy from the murky mother liquor of organizational thought by the editors of the contemporary pharmaceutical journals is a social force which must be recognized, indeed, a force which cannot be ignored.

---

193. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: Needed: A Supreme Court for Pharmacy," American Druggist, 149: 9, June 22, 1964.

194. Ibid.

195. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: A Charter for Pharmacy's Supreme Court," American Druggist, 150: 6-8, August 3, 1964.

CHAPTER VIII

EDITORIAL VIEWS ON PHARMACY'S RELATIONS TO THE PUBLIC

In tracing the economic and structural development of retail pharmacy in the United States,[1] Sonnedecker remarked that "the late-19th century pharmacy commanded considerable respect among the average citizenry."[2] In recent years, however, in the eyes of many observers, the profession of pharmacy seems to have languished considerably in this respect, and its practice presently suffers from a three-pronged prod of public ignorance, indifference and indignation. In this chapter we will attempt to explain how some of these attitudes may have been brought about in the public's mind by a careful study of relevant contemporary editorials.

In this regard, we shall limit our discussion to the several subject groupings within the category "Profession and practice of pharmacy" which upon examination were thought to yield relevant material. The subject groupings include the areas of professional problems, "professionalism," the image of pharmacy and the pharmacist, public relations, pharmacy as viewed by the lay press, and changes in practice (review Tables I and IV, Chapter IV, and

---

1. Glenn Sonnedecker, Kremers and Urdang's History of Pharmacy (third edition) (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1963), pp. 263-281.

2. Ibid., p. 278.

Tables XI and XIV, Chapter V). The five subject groupings contain a total of 154 editorial subjects, or 32.6 per cent of the 502 editorial subjects within the category "Profession and practice of pharmacy."

The impact of the mass media was first felt in the writings of such muckrakers as Lincoln Steffens, Upton Sinclair, and Ida Tarbell during the Progressive movement of the early 1900's. The waves of public protest and reform brought strict regulatory legislation and trust-busting. For a while businessmen sat helplessly by, inarticulate and frustrated, waiting apprehensively for the next issue of McClure's Magazine; soon, they felt the urge to speak out in self-defense but did not know how to reach the people. Thus began the large-scale recruitment of newspapermen to serve as interpreters for the corporations and institutions. For the most part, however, these ex-newspapermen in the employ of business countered with whitewash and press-agentry.[3]

Up to this point, the practice of public relations had been defensive in nature; the first great offensive impetus came with World War I and George Creel. Emphasizing the positive approach, Creel and his effective Committee on Public Information demonstrated as never before the power of mass publicity and the techniques of

---

3. Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations (second edition) (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), p. 32.

mobilizing opinion. The Liberty Loan drives, although based primarily on advertising techniques, taught businessmen how public relations practices could be used effectively. The subsequent events are well described in Creel's book, How We Advertised America.[4]

Vigorously generated by wartime developments, the new specialty quickly spread, as reflected in Edward L. Bernays' Crystallizing Public Opinion, the first book on public relations (1923) and Walter Lippmann's classic Public Opinion (1922), a book that has had a profound influence. Here, too, began the shift of scholarly interest of social scientists from the power to the nature of public opinion and the role of communications in its formation; market research, social surveys, and public opinion polls gained headway during the postwar years, which also saw the definite beginnings of institutional advertising as a public relations tool.[5] The practice moved full speed ahead until October 29, 1929. The ensuing depression marked another milestone, and Bernays has written of this period.[6]

Events flowing from the depression and the New Deal brought home to every group the need for building informed

---

4. Ibid., p. 45.

5. Ibid., p. 41.

6. E. L. Bernays, Public Relations (Boston: Bellman Publishing Company, 1945), pp. 10-11.

public support. A new trend set in, marked by the institutions' and industries' acceptance of their social responsibility; it increasingly came to be realized that profitable public relationships could be built only by coupling responsible performance with persuasive publicity. There was also a marked trend away from occasional defensive efforts and toward continuous and positive programs by specialized public relations departments. The dates on which such departments were established by some of the larger firms is indicative: General Foods, 1929; General Motors, 1931; United States Steel, 1936.[7]

The onrush of World War II accelerated this trend; once more the government led the way with a breathtaking demonstration of the power of an organized informational campaign. This time it was called the Office of War Information, capably directed by Elmer Davis. Davis and the O.W.I. set the pace for extensive expansion of the practice of public relations in the armed forces, industry, and allied fields: more techniques were developed and many new practitioners were trained in this gigantic program which completely dwarfed the Creel Committee. The accelerating developments from World War II on have been the most extensive yet recorded, and works by such latter-day muckrakers as Vance Packard have made such terms as "social status," "engineers of consent," and "public image" a part of the American language.

---

7. Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 44.

The foregoing has been set forth to indicate that a vehicle did exist to bring the story of pharmacy to the public; that the vehicle has not been used properly (when used at all) is a serious indictment against not only the so-called leaders in pharmacy, but also the editors of the six journals considered in this study, who presumably should have been aware of the power of public opinion. Some summarily dismissed discussion of the matter on the grounds that it was beneath the dignity of the profession to engage in such carryings-on; others offered such crassly commercial schemes to win public favor that the professionally-minded pharmacists of the time--who were in such an excellent position to favorably affect public opinion--rejected the plans on this basis, ignoring the procedural grain of truth they contained. What little advice was offered was generally bad; what little good advice remained was generally ignored. Those few who claimed to see the handwriting on the wall usually adopted a messianic tone, evoking all sorts of classical allegories and sometimes embarrassing Biblical allusions (the editors who saw themselves as "voices crying out from the wilderness" are included here) to drive home their point.

It is our contention that what we have referred to as an essentially myopic disorder in the profession of pharmacy regarding organization is compounded with astigmatism when referring to public relations efforts aimed at

bringing the story of the profession to the American people.

Editorial discussions of professionalism during the early 1920's assumed two formats: self-esteeming and self-effacing. Charles W. Parsons of the American Druggist could be depended upon to provide the former; George M. Beringer and Ivor Griffith of the American Journal of Pharmacy provided the breast-beating for the latter. Beringer's editorials, tinged with history and sprinkled with poetry, were written in a charming nineteenth-century style, and nothing pleased Beringer more than to discuss professionalism. "No person has rightfully a place in a profession that he does not love," Beringer wrote. "The mere fact that he has succeeded in passing the required examinations for the diploma and the license to practice does not signify that he is enthused with the spirit and love of the profession and that its ideals can be safely entrusted to his care."[8] "And oh!," Griffith apostrophized, "for a keener appreciation today--this today of so much insincere dealing, this today of unfinished tasks, this today of questionable business practices. Oh, for a real understanding of the infalliability of . . . . HONOR, INTEGRITY, and TRUSTWORTHINESS, they are the Priceless

---

8. George M. Beringer, "To Work for One's Profession, A Duty," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 769, November, 1920.

Ingredients."[9] The tone is characteristic of the Journal, and although subsequent editors were not as rhetorical, they were certainly as concerned with the highest ethical and professional standards for pharmacy.

Parsons, on the other hand, had no reservations about the pharmacist:

> Possessing cultural attainments and specialized scientific training, he is the guardian of the general well-being, even the lives of his patrons . . . . In worthiness and trained efficiency he has no superior. . . .
>
> His is a service of the highest type. His profession is a medical specialty, as complex as the physician's and requiring as much training.[10]
>
> He is a reliance in sickness and dire emergency, and a convenience in the smaller, every day affairs. He is more accommodating, more tactful, more appreciative of patronage, than any other merchant. . . . Pharmacy, vulnerable, dignified and time honored, a profession requiring painstaking and scientific preparation, owes certain obligations to the community and consequently commands the respect of the community, based primarily upon the service rendered.[11]

---

9. Ivor Griffith, "The Master Formula--Honor, Integrity and Trustworthiness," American Journal of Pharmacy, 98: 626, October, 1922.

10. Charles W. Parsons(?), "The Druggist's Relation To the Community," American Druggist, 72: 30, June, 1924.

11. Charles W. Parsons(?), "A Community Asset," American Druggist, 72: 38, September, 1924.

It is significant to note that the above are intra-, not extra-professional communications, and even though Parsons admitted that "the drug store must be conducted along lines of straightforward business principles to win and hold the good will and confidence of the people,"[12] such spasms of self-congratulation were not at all uncommon, and indicate an essential naivete with regard to the importance of public opinion and a certain insularity which would prove injurious to the profession.

To some editors' minds, at least, the biggest problem of the early 1920's was professional adjustments to two major pieces of legislation passed in the decade prior: the Harrison Narcotic Act (1914) and the Volstead (Prohibition Enforcement Act (1919). Eugene G. Eberle, editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, remarked that,

> Thoughtful anticipation should suggest foresighted preparation for changing conditions and development in pharmacy and the drug business, due to legislation and our responsibilities thereunder. "Am I my brother's keeper?" can only be answered in the affirmative . . . .
>
> The greater number of pharmacists would prefer to discontinue the sale of alcoholics and narcotics under all circumstances but, in our opinion, it becomes a duty to supply them on physicians' orders.[13]

---

12. Parsons, "The Druggist's Relation to the Community," loc. cit.

13. E. G. Eberle, "None of Us Liveth to Himself," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 759-760, August, 1920.

Parsons, too, believed that the druggists were "doing their best to conform to the letter and intent of the narcotic law," but indicated that they "would be perfectly willing to have all narcotic taken out completely from the drug stores and handled only under government supervision in government depots."[14] Here we have an early indication of pharmacy's all-too-often willingness to surrender its professional responsibilities to the state or to smother them by legal cloaks, another disconcerting thread we must weave into our tapestry.

Oddly enough, it was violations of these laws which first seemed to indicate the need of the profession to communicate to its publics. By 1924, the problem had reached the point where even conservatively-minded Eberle had to admit that "a comparative few have been prompted by mercenary motives to speculate on the weaknesses and gullibility of a class of individuals who cannot or do not exercise the power of self-control."[15] He continued cautiously:

> If classed as pharmacists, such individuals should be earnestly dissuaded or, if they will continue the practice, very

---

14. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Demand Discontinuance of 'Drug' in Referring to Narcotic Evil," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 31, March, 1922.

15. E. G. Eberle, "Misapplied Benefits Result in Evil," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 689, August, 1924.

> much firmer methods should be applied; they bring disrepute on pharmacy.[16]

Eberle concluded that "each individual has an opportunity in his own community to correct misinformation relating to pharmacy."[17] From the start, apparently, public relations efforts for pharmacy had a defensive tone.

The defense, in this case, did not rest. Indignant convention resolutions and editorial appeals to the lay press to refrain from using the word "drug" when "narcotic" was meant were routinely ignored or dismissed;[18] Samuel C. Henry, editor of the N.A.R.D. Journal, confessed he was "at a loss to know how the situation can be set forth in plainer or more readily understood language than heretofore employed," and decided that "the only thing to do is to continue the effort to secure the cooperation of these publishers through an educational campaign."[19] Henry's own unsuccessful sally in this regard is amusing.[20]

Such semantic stigmata notwithstanding, a few journal editors seemed to sense the importance of public under-

---

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Parsons, loc. cit.; Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Abuse of the Word 'Drug'," The Practical Druggist, 40: 15, February, 1922; Samuel C. Henry, "Maligning the Drug Trade," N.A.R.D. Journal, 37: 1037-1038, March 20, 1924.

19. Henry, op. cit., p. 1037.

20. Samuel C. Henry, "Druggists Assailed," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 929-930, March 1, 1923; "Druggists and the Dope Traffic," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 1057-1059, March 22, 1923.

standing. Parsons grasped the first rule of public relations practice when he stated: "It has been repeatedly asserted that American pharmacy is sick, is grievously tormented of various ills, but a competent, thorough diagnosis has not been made, not to speak of a comforting prognosis."[21] Parsons' answer to the diagnostic question took the form of an "exhaustive" potpourri of letters to the editor, some of which are still depressingly relevant.[22] Parsons, however, found "only superficial or simple ailments, readily susceptible to treatment to a final and complete cure."[23] Parsons evoked another rule somewhat later when he stated:

> Pharmacy will not attain the dignity of a pure profession until the public has been educated and is compelled to recognize it as such, and this means slow and steady endeavor, not spasmodic and erratic floundering.[24]

Eberle, too, seemed cognizant of public opinion, and urged that pharmacists "bring the public to a better understanding

---

21. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Is Pharmacy Sick?," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 24, December, 1921.

22. "What Is the Matter With Pharmacy?," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 25-31, December, 1921.

23. Parsons, loc. cit.

24. Charles W. Parsons(?), "Commercial: Professional," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 30, March, 1922.

of what pharmacy is and of the protection given them by right service--thereby misunderstanding will give way to a higher appreciation of the service of pharmacy and of pharmacists."[25] Later he explained that "this can be done by cooperative effort--there must be publicity; as we judge others from our viewpoints, so others judge us from theirs, not ours."[26] Publicity, indeed, seemed to some to be pharmacy's "most urgent need."[27] Such slogans as "Your Druggist Is More Than a Merchant" and the N.A.R.D.'s "Try the Drug Store First," despite their rather commercial connotations, were heavily promoted with some success,[28] although the latter lent itself more to the inevitable personalization.[29]

One of the more sustained, if not always the most effective, publicity efforts launched to reinterpret and bolster public understanding of the pharmcist's professional

---

25. E. G. Eberle, "Bringing About a Better Understanding of Pharmacy by the Public," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 574, July, 1923.

26. E. G. Eberle, "A Deduction from Lord Kelvin's Centenary Applied to Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 690, August, 1924.

27. Samuel C. Henry, "Publicity for Pharmacy," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 486, December 14, 1922.

28. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "To Acquaint the Public," The Practical Druggist, 41: 16, September, 1923; Samuel C. Henry, "Try the Drug Store First," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 487, December 14, 1922.

29. Samuel C. Henry, "Our Slogan," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 14, January 4, 1923.

functions was National Pharmacy Week, a project suggested in 1924 by pharmacist Robert J. Ruth in an address before the American Pharmaceutical Association's Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing, and initiated that same year.[30] Sonnedecker has observed that National Pharmacy Week established a pattern and a time for stressing the service rendered by professional pharmaceutical work to the American people in particular, although he admitted that "it eventually became obscured amid a welter of commercial 'weeks' that crowd the American calendar."[31] This observation is borne out in our data. The N.A.R.D. Journal attached the greatest importance to National Pharmacy Week (see Table XIV, Chapter V), and although its celebration created an inordinate amount of editorial commentary during the early 1930's, subsequent generations of editors paid less and less attention to it (see Table IV, Chapter IV).*

Outside of the editorial references made to National Pharmacy Week and its importance, little stress was placed

---

30. E. G. Eberle, "Popularizing the Pharmacist," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 886, October, 1924; Robert J. Ruth, "The History of National Pharmacy Week," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 696-706, July, 1931.

31. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 280.

*Upon examination, the editorials dealing with National Pharmacy Week were found to be overly repetitious, and were therefore not analyzed in detail.

on public relations for pharmacy during the early 1930's. The editors, as we have seen, were primarily concerned with economic conditions forced on pharmacy by the depression; however, the rapid growth of chain stores[32] and other mass-merchandising retail outlets, such as supermarkets, were affecting the independent pharmacist more than ever before, and editorials on professionalism during this period were centered around one of two basic themes: restrictive legislation to decrease competition, or expanded practice to combat it.

Restrictive legislation was espoused by Eberle, who questioned whether "one who does not fully realize the obligations assumed in handling drugs and medicines should be permitted to deal in them."[33] He pointed out, however, that such legislation should not be looked upon as a professional panacea:

> In all court decisions in which restrictive measures apply to the sales of medicine there is a question of safeguarding the life and health of the citizens . . . .
>
> . . . Unless there is more involved than handing out a package, more than an ordinary sale wherein one salesman has not better understanding than another of

32. Ibid., p. 272.

33. E. G. Eberle, "'The Quality of Men in Pharmacy of First Importance'," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 937, September, 1930.

> what the package contains, the decisions have not favored restriction; but in cases wherein knowledge gave the public protection, the decisions rendered have, by inference if not otherwise, stated the importance of pharmaceutical service.[34]

Eberle felt that this proliferation of marketing drugs and drug-containing preparations in non-pharmacy outlets could be blamed on the American public for the most part--"the American citizen wants what he wants and when he wants it"--and he complained that,

> The public has no clear appreciation of the fundamentally important role of pharmacy included in the drug-trade activities and, as a consequence, is not as deeply concerned about pharmacy as it should be . . . . progress in the development of pharmacy is dependent on encouragement by the public to uphold professional ideals which may be more important than conveniences and price.[35]

The idea that professionalism should be fostered in the pharmacist by the public is one that remained unique to Eberle. Robert L. Swain, then head of the A.Ph.A.'s Drug Trade Bureau of Public Information, pointed to a key issue in developing favorable public opinions when he stated

---

34. Ibid., pp. 937-938.

35. E. G. Eberle, "The Restriction of the Sale of Medicines to Those Qualified by Education and Training," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 88, February, 1933.

that pharmacists "should be made vividly aware of their importance in the proper development of the profession . . . . They should be made to see that the future value and security of the profession depend, in a very great degree, upon that public attitude which they themselves fashion and control."[36]

Roosevelt's ill-fated National Recovery Act (1933-1935) and its codes caused mixed reactions in the pharmaceutical press. The exemption of pharmacists from the blanket code restricting employment and store hours caused vigorous protests from department stores and other retail groups[37] and even some misunderstanding among pharmacists, who viewed the exemption as discriminatory.[38] Eberle, for example, at first thought that the codes were "essential" and that "the public must take a greater interest in forcing compliance with honest practices,"[39] later saw that the subsequent codes relating to the retail drug industry "has brought druggists, proprietors and clerks, face to face with the possibilities of lessened prestige" if "too much

---

36. Ibid., p. 89.

37. John W. Dargavel, "Late Hours," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 682, August 24, 1933.

38. John W. Dargavel, "Government Regulation," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 682, August 24, 1933.

39. E. G. Eberle, "Individuality and Responsibility," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 1076, November, 1933.

stress is placed on price, by reducing standard products to uneconomic levels, selling varied sundries and offering unwarranted premiums to attract patronage" or if "a majority of drug stocks closely resemble merchandise lines of non-related stores and 'cut' prices emphasize that there is no difference in their kind and quality," and warned that "continued under-evaluation of the foundation [i.e., professional practice] and a tendency to have drug stores resemble merchandise emporiums is molding public opinion accordingly."[40] The stimulating effect of the NRA codes in changing the face of America's pharmacies has often been overlooked.

The subsequent tendencies toward open displays, self-service, and open prescription departments were vigorously opposed by some editors. "Our drug stores," commented editor Herbert R. Mayes of the American Druggist, "to retain their favor with the public, must remain drug stores, first and fundamentally. Regardless of their essential activity, which is merchandising, their aspect must continue professional. Anybody can run a junk shop."[41] Similar defensive measures, particularly on the west coast,

---

40. E. G. Eberle, "The NRA May Stress the Druggists' Responsibilities and Point to the Way for Improving Drug Store Practice," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 23: 180, March, 1934.

41. Herbert R. Mayes, "Dress UP...not Down," American Druggist, 85: 19, February, 1932.

were reported in the pages of The Practical Druggist and Spatula and the N.A.R.D. Journal.[42] The economic pinch felt by the consumer during the early 1930's intensified the belief that the pharmacist's profit on the preparations of prescriptions is enormous. Fred B. Kilmer, in a guest editorial in the staid American Journal of Pharmacy, reported that the belief was "widespread," and "whatever the price be, he [the customer] thinks that he is being overcharged," and urged that the preparing and dispensing of a prescription "must be accompanied by good salesmanship" and its delivery accompanied "by words that will inspire confidence."[43] The N.A.R.D. Journal's Henry, on the other hand, felt that "the average retailer places too much emphasis on price in the appeal for public patronage and too little reliance on . . . the type and character of service rendered and the community and the professional standing of the pharmacist, however much of a merchandiser he may become."[44]

---

42. Reginald E. Dyer(?), "Prescription Departments--Open or Closed," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 52: 39, September, 1934; George A. Bender(?), "You Must 'Deliver'," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 1106, October 18, 1934.

43. Fred B. Kilmer, "The Price of a Prescription," American Journal of Pharmacy, 104: 702-703, November, 1932.

44. Samuel C. Henry, "Personality the Keystone," N.A.R.D. Journal, 53: 6, October 1, 1931.

When it became evident that the so-called "side lines" were not only subject to fierce competitive price cutting from non-pharmacy outlets, but also were not "turning" often enough to yield the expected net profit, the proponents of expanded professional service took their turn at the editorial bat. Eberle noted an evident "back to pharmacy" trend as early as 1931, and said that there were opportunities for most pharmacists "to plan their stocks on a profit-producing basis by the inclusion of items that bear a closer relation to pharmacy."[45] Pointing to changing concepts in medical care, Kilmer remarked in the American Journal of Pharmacy that first aid supplies for the laity "remains an unworked field,"[46] and later urged the pharmacist "to assume the role of health advisor to the community in which he lives" and to enter the homes of his patrons to "survey the home, and recommend, persuade, exhort in all matters pertaining to the health and well-being of the inmates."[47] The concept of expanded professional practice

---

45. E. G. Eberle, "The Trend of Pharmacy in its Relation to the Public," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 1260, December, 1931.

46. Fred B. Kilmer, "Today and Tomorrow in Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 103: 545-546, October, 1931.

47. Fred B. Kilmer, "Technocracy and the Drug Store," American Journal of Pharmacy, 105: 97, March, 1933.

during the early 1930's was for the most part thinly-veiled attempts to substitute less competitive lines of merchandise for those which had been usurped by other retail outlets.

By the early 1940's, a definite trend toward establishing pharmacies which specialized in professional services, including health-related supplies could be noted. In 1931 it was estimated that less than 1 per cent of all pharmacies (350-400) were receiving 50 per cent or more of their total sales from their prescription departments;[48] fifteen years later the American Professional Pharmacist believed that about one pharmacy in five could be called "professionally minded," with nearly 700 dispensing at least 75 prescriptions a day.[49]

The American Professional Pharmacist, indeed, itself may be seen as both an effect and a cause (its editors modestly admit) of the professional trend in pharmacy. Literally dozens of editorials urging a "return to pharmacy" and extolling the virtues of professional practice were written during this period by John N. McDonnell and,

---

48. C. B. Jordan, "Address of the Chairman of the House of Delegates," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 812, August, 1931, cited by Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 278.

49. John N. McDonnell(?), "Welcome to 6,000 Pharmacists," American Professional Pharmacist, 11: 907, October, 1945, cited by Sonnedecker, loc. cit.

later, by Madeline Oxford Holland. The effect these scathing editorials may have had upon the contemporary practice of pharmacy is somewhat tempered by the fact that the journal was "sent exclusively to a selected list of the country's leading prescription pharmacists and hospital pharmacists and pharmaceutical educators," whose ideals and practices, presumably, are usually beyond repute. The catalyst, strangely enough, seemed to be World War II, in editor McDonnell's mind.[50]

> No longer are we "crying alone in the wilderness," Sooner than we dreamed, we see the coming separation of "pharmacies" from "drug stores." Perhaps this may be Pharmacy's last opportunity, to cleanse our own Augean Stables, if we don't do it . . . someone else will do it for us. . . . Our Associations and our Boards had better abandon their profit and politics, pettiness and purility. Remember that Pharmacy lives by the grace of Government, is the companion of Medicine. And the threads of patience are running thin.[51]

The lack of respect paid pharmacy by government, the allied professions, and the public was viewed as "criminal" by

---

50. John N. McDonnell, "The Bell Tolls," American Professional Pharmacist, 8: 150, 196, March, 1942; "On the March," American Professional Pharmacist, 8: 691, November, 1942.

51. John N. McDonnell, "What is Pharmacy Going to Do?," American Professional Pharmacist, 7: 289, May, 1941.

McDonnell, and the blame for this situation placed in the lap of the average pharmacist: "Much of this disrespect has been brought on by pharmacy's lack of self-respect. The average druggist today can have no defender. He merits little consideration as a professional man."[52]

This was not an unique conceit on McDonnell's part. John W. Dargavel, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists (N.A.R.D.), believing that "the pharmacists of the nation as a whole are as much or more interested in the professional side of their business as in the merchandising phase," announced a new special feature in the N.A.R.D. Journal, the Pharmacy Section.[53] "Upon better professional service; upon the public's greater appreciation of it," wrote Dargavel, "rests the fate of the drug store, as such. . . . For better pharmaceutical service--that is the goal toward which most pharmacists may logically aim their efforts."[54]

The Practical Pharmacy Edition of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association emerged in 1940 as

---

52. John N. McDonnell, "Respect," American Professional Pharmacist, 7: 491, August, 1941.

53. John W. Dargavel, "For Better Professional Service," N.A.R.D. Journal, 62: 97, January 18, 1940.

54. Ibid.

another response to the professional trend. "We have taken as our objective the publication of the most practical, useable, professional journal available to the pharmacist to-day," wrote editor Robert W. Rodman in 1941, and pledged to keep the pharmacist "up-to-date with new developments in compounding methods, in pharmaceutical research, in medical techniques, in legislation and to show him how other pharmacists are meeting problems similar to those he is facing."[55] Rodman also hinted at a latent inferiority complex peculiar to pharmacy when he stated: "To be successful, a pharmacist must believe in pharmacy. He must be convinced of the public need for his services."[56]

Linwood F. Tice, editor of the American Journal of Pharmacy, agreed with McDonnell that the trend toward professionalism could never have a telling effect upon public opinion unless it was supported by the rank and file in the profession. Although Tice was "willing to admit the necessity of certain fundamental business practices in the conduct of pharmacy," he lashed out at "certain commercial interests" which had exploited the profession:

---

55. Robert W. Rodman, "On the Beam," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 2: 3, January, 1941.

56. Ibid., p. 2.

> Is it any wonder that when we cry for the rights and privileges due a profession we are without support? Is it any wonder that medical groups consider our proposals for greater collaboration with "tongue in cheek"?
>
> Our own leaders recognize these evils but avoid any public action with the well-worn plea of the necessity of being tolerant and broad-minded. Most of the pharmaceutical press, which is read to any extent, is restrained from open criticism by the necessity of expediency and those of us who remain are indeed but a voice crying in the wilderness, unheard and unheeded.[57]

What was the public's opinion of pharmacy during the early 1940's? If we can believe the contemporary editorials, it had reached an all-time low. In a guest editorial in the American Druggist, Ole Salthe, Consultant to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, quoted the following as typical of consumer attitudes toward pharmacy:

> 1. That the drug trade in general spends too much on advertising;
> 2. That nationally advertised brands must sell for higher prices than private brands;
> 3. That many proprietary medicines . . . if not harmful, are useless;
> 4. That much drug and cosmetic advertising is in bad taste . . .;
> 5. That the drug industry is beset with excessive product differentiation. . . .[58]

---

57. L. F. Tice, "'By Their Deeds Shall Ye Know Them'," American Journal of Pharmacy, 114: 240, July, 1942.

58. Ole Salthe, "Why Doesn't the Druggist Tell the Consumer?," American Druggist, 102: 152, November, 1940.

Dargavel brought his readers' attention to an article which appeared in the Hearstian Saturday Home Magazine, a nationally-distributed newspaper supplement. Author Charles Neville had apparently read some excerpts from a paper by Dr. Wallace M. Yater, chairman of the section on experimental medicine and therapeutics of the American Medical Association, and this had formed the basis for a scurillous attack upon both medicine and pharmacy:

> Doc Yater . . . . urged that croakers stop writing prescriptions in Latin double-talk, befuddling the customer and impressing him with their vast learning. These emm dees grab a blank and write "Rx talis pullules caloris in habistrobis on de rillera"--which the suffering patient rushes to his drug clerk. This bird, who loves to be called "Doc", assumes a profound look, and after fiddling with the bottles in the back room, emerges with some powdered bicarbonate and says: "That'll be four bucks, bud."[59]

Dargavel urged that pharmacists "flood their local Hearst newspaper editorial offices with protests" against this type of article, and noted that the American Druggist, another Hearst publication, "has a job to do right in its own back yard to prove its friendship for the druggist."[60]

---

59. John W. Dargavel, "Editorially Speaking," N.A.R.D. Journal, 64: 1083, August 20, 1942; also see Charles Neville, "Even Medicoes Gag at Their Pill English!," Saturday Home Magazine, August 1, 1942.

60. Ibid.

The methods for improving the public image of the pharmacist were as varied as the editors themselves: McDonnell believed that part of the answer lay in semantics, and called for "a redefinition or reinterpretation of terminology" related to pharmacy to intensify the "cut-rate"-"druggist"-"drug store" versus the "professional"-"ethical"-"pharmacist"-"pharmacy" dichotomy he was trying to create.[61] Another editorial railed against the use of the word "prescription" in conjunction with extra rations or restricted commodities provided during the war to those in serious need.[62] Dargavel and Tice agreed that the problem was internal, not external.[63] Tice wrote that physicians would make use of pharmacy in exactly the same ratio as it served their need and added that,

> half-hearted and slip-shod effort coupled with non-professional store environment cannot be overcome solely by inter-professional relations committees, tirades against dispensing doctors and other ineffective devices. When pharmacy

---

61. John N. McDonnell, "Trust Not to Outward Show," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 485, August, 1940.

62. John N. McDonnell, "What is a Prescription?" American Professional Pharmacist, 9: 155, March, 1943.

63. John W. Dargavel, "Today's Opportunities," N.A.R.D. Journal, 63: 163, February 6, 1941; L. F. Tice, "The Trend of Medicinal Agents and its Effect on Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 114: 112-113, April, 1942.

> recognizes its challenge and meets it universally in a manner worthy of a profession, proper recognition, respect and interprofessional good-will will be accomplished without other effort.[64]

Yet a guest editorial in the N.A.R.D. Journal by John F. McCloskey, Dean of the College of Pharmacy of Loyola University, indicated that many pharmacists were holding the court of public opinion in contempt.[65]

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Bernays Drug and Pharmaceutical Survey, completed in 1943, found "low professional prestige" for pharmacy among the public, as compared to other professions, and noted that "many pharmacists themselves . . . show little respect for their profession, and this negative attitude only aggravates the public's disrespect."[66] It is no less surprising that the Survey did not receive a favorable reception within the pharmacy fraternity.[67] The growing concern among association leaders about the public's conception of pharmacy had

---

64. Tice, op. cit., p. 113.

65. John F. McCloskey, "Post-war Customers," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 91, January 17, 1944.

66. Edward L. Bernays, "The Bernays Drug and Pharmaceutical Study," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Scientific Edition), 32: 372, December, 1943.

67. Sonnedecker, op. cit., p. 225; also see Rufus A. Lyman, "The Editor's Page," American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 7: 574-575, October, 1943.

been noted earlier in the editorial pages of the American Druggist,[68] and although editor John W. McPherrin admitted that Bernays did not "discover any new truths about Pharmacy," he pointed out that it did define and outline them for clear thinking,[69] and in an open letter to the chairman of the ways and means committee appointed to recommend solutions to pharmacy's public relations problems, McPherrin pledged his support, stating, "We believe that the great majority are so anxious to have a good public relations program in action that they will forgive you if it is not perfect, but they won't if it is too late."[70]

Early in 1944, McDonnell complained that associations had done nothing to improve the public's valuation of pharmacy: "Too many have been content merely to demand without evidence of worth, and too many content with their lot as it was."[71] The next few months saw the formation of

---

68. Harold W. Hutchins, "Doing Business in the Name of Pharmacy," American Druggist, 106: 17, September, 1942; John W. McPherrin, "Good News for Pharmacy," American Druggist, 107: 29, May, 1943.

69. John W. McPherrin, "Add...'For the Dignity of Pharmacy'," American Druggist, 108: 43, October, 1943.

70. John W. McPherrin, "An Open Letter to E. Walton Bobst," American Druggist, 109: 39, January, 1944; also see: Edward L. Bernays, "What's Wrong with Pharmacy?," American Druggist, 108: 48, 100, 103, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 164, 166, October, 1943; "What Druggists Say About the Bernays Survey," American Druggist, 109: 58, 106, 108, January, 1944.

71. John N. McDonnell, "Recognition," American Professional Pharmacist, 10: 169, March, 1944.

National Pharmacy Committee on Public Information, in which all the important phases of pharmacy, including the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D., were represented. N.A.R.D.'s Dargavel stated that "pharmacy has often failed to know itself, and in that failure lies the source of many of our troubles. We complain that the public misunderstands us, when perhaps the reason is that we do not understand ourselves."[72] Dargavel explained that the Committee had grown out of the Bernays Survey, and although he agreed with McPherrin that the report did not bring out "anything that many of us had not long suspected, but confirmed what we had thought," he granted "it was a beginning in the process of learning to know ourselves. . . . After we have learned to know ourselves, we shall be in a better situation to interpret ourselves to the public." "After all," he concluded, "a public relations program involves much more than getting a lot of publicity."[73]

By the early 1950's, the scene had shifted considerably. The expected post-war recession had turned out to be an unexpected boom; pharmacies were prospering all over the nation, and many pharmacists were making money in spite of

---

72. John W. Dargavel, "Editorially Speaking," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 1233, July 17, 1944.

73. Ibid.

themselves--and their attitudes toward the public. The rift which had developed between the A.Ph.A. and the N.A.R.D. made further joint public relations efforts impossible, while higher prescription prices--especially for the "wonder drugs" developed during the war--began to be noticed by the public, as most pharmacists blithely continued to add their requisite forty per cent to the higher costs of the new medicines. A book titled Public Relations for the Pharmacist appeared during this period, and although it was purported to offer "an explicit, really workable public relations program which you can put into effect inexpensively and to great advantage", the slim volume was long on publicity and short on basic concepts, despite the author's protestations to the contrary.[74]

When discussing the profession of pharmacy, however, the editors in our sample dwelt not on public relations, but on other matters far removed; pick up and delivery of prescriptions by Western Union,[75] the sale of proprietaries and the evils of self-service,[76] although Tice

---

74. William H. Hull, Public Relations for the Pharmacist (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1955), front flyleaf, p. viii.

75. Robert P. Fischelis, "A Dangerous Procedure," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 11: 601, 624, October, 1950.

76. L. F. Tice, "Professional Contact or Self-Service?" American Journal of Pharmacy, 122: 124-125, April, 1950; "Again We Fail," American Journal of Pharmacy, 123: 76-77, March, 1951.

pointed out the loss of public confidence in the pharmacist was reflected in the contemporary court rulings overthrowing the traditional restriction of sales of drugs to licensed pharmacies.[77] The main editorial thrust, however, dealt with the unethical practice of substitution, spurred on by the controversy over the Durham-Humphrey Amendments to the federal Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, referred to in an earlier chapter.[78]

In the latter portion of this period, however, editorials dealing with various aspects of public relations for pharmacy began to appear, particularly in the pages of the American Professional Pharmacist and the N.A.R.D. Journal, although a few mentions were found elsewhere in the sample. Peter J. Sletterdahl, editor of the latter journal, defined public relations as "everything that contributes to the development and also the maintenance of

---

77. L. F. Tice, "The Sale of Home Remedies," American Journal of Pharmacy, 125: 322-323, October, 1953.

78. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Substitution and Imitation," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 691, August, 1952; L. F. Tice, "Substitution--A Threat to Our Profession," American Journal of Pharmacy, 124: 248-250, August, 1952; Robert P. Fischelis, "Substitution Must Be Defined," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 772-773, November, 1952; Robert L. Swain, "Boards' Implied Powers," Drug Topics, 97: 58, April 20, 1963; Robert L. Swain, "Substitution Cure," Drug Topics, 98: 58, March 8, 1954; Madeline Oxford Holland, "Counterfeit Drugs," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 1041, November, 1954.

prestige and goodwill," and listed such "effective activities" as "considerate treatment of customers, efforts that insure excellent service, leadership contributed to the betterment of the community and stimulation of confidence through exceptional performance."[79] Although Sletterdahl's concept of public relations included little more than mere courtesy, the point that pharmacists possess an educational background and knowledge that would enable a large percentage of them to be leaders of community welfare projects, a point he explained later,[80] is well taken. In subsequent editorials, Sletterdahl referred to the growing interest taken by the N.A.R.D.[81] and other pharmaceutical associations (state and local) in public relations activities.[82]

Madeline Oxford Holland, editor of the American Professional Pharmacist, added the woman's touch to public relations when she reminded her readers that the person who has to have a prescription filled "is not usually well and therefore should he happen to be irritable or grouchy

---

79. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "Prestige and Goodwill," N.A.R.D. Journal, 72: 734, May 15, 1950.

80. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "Editorial Comments," N.A.R.D. Journal, 75: 150, January 5, 1953.

81. Ibid.

82. Peter J. Sletterdahl, "Editorial Comments," N.A.R.D. Journal., 75: 370, March 2, 1953.

he should be treated with kindness rather than nastiness."[83] Holland seemed to have inherited her predecessor's predilection for proper parlance when she spoke out against pharmacists advertising themselves with such statements as "Prescriptions Accurately Compounded," or "Only Ethical Pharmacy in Town," rightfully pointing out that such "public relations" implied that other pharmacists or pharmacies were not operating properly, which may or may not have been the case. Such statements as "the druggist is your doctor's right hand man!" Holland felt, conveyed to the public that pharmacy was not a profession of its own, but rather a subservient trade to the medical profession.[84] Again, she wrote that the use of a universally-recognized designation for the pharmacist (such as R.P.) "should lead to more widespread recognition" of pharmacy by the public.[85] Although her concept of public relations practice was somewhat naive, Holland performed a service to her readers when she discussed public attitudes on the cost of drugs in her columns:

---

83. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Personality," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 875, October, 1952.

84. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Independent Profession," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 893, November, 1953.

85. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Professional Designation--R.P.," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 237, March, 1954.

> One of the important public relations problems not being adequately met by the practicing pharmacist is correcting the common concept that modern medication is over-priced.
>
> Laymen . . . . often feel . . . that their [prescription] price bears no relation to their cost of production and that it is fixed solely by what the market will bear.[86]

Holland pointed out that the average customer knew little of the expense involved in developing new drugs, the price reductions which take place when their production rises, or the large inventory with low turnover which characterizes prescription service.

> All these things are our fault as pharmacists. Many pharmacists themselves are apologetic in charging for their products and services. They never try to educate the public on the tremendous task of producing and supplying today's drugs. Pharmacists only too often . . . . [side] with the patient against the manufacturer little realizing that, in the final analysis, this poor psychology leads the patient to condemn them both. . . .
>
> We, in pharmacy, have a real story to tell and it needs telling. . . .
>
> Every pharmacist in his community should try to educate the public on the true meaning of pharmacy and its service.[87]

---

86. Madeline Oxford Holland, "Public Attitudes on the Cost of Drugs," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 573, May, 1953.

87. Ibid.; also see Madeline Oxford Holland, "Prescription Fees and Public Relations," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 617, 694, July, 1954.

But it was John W. McPherrin who put his editorial finger on the crux of the matter:

> There would be no lack of support for pharmacy as a profession if all pharmacists expressed faith in themselves and their ability to serve the public. The greatest problem of pharmacy is to stamp out the unhappy inferiority complex that seems to paralyze some pharmacists. Their lack of confidence in themselves is obvious to their customers. They would have no professional standing whatsoever if it were not for the many good pharmacists whose achievements have given pharmacy the prestige that it does enjoy.
> .....
> The best public relations program is good public performance by every member of the . . . profession.[88]

By the early 1960's, however, a coordinated public relations effort for pharmacy had still not emerged. The profession was buffeted by blows from all sides: the so-called "high cost of drugs" had still not been adequately explained to the public, and pharmacy reeled from the one-two punch of the Kefauver investigation and the establishment of union-operated pharmacies;[89] the pharmacist's professional function came under close scrutiny in

---

88. John W. McPherrin, "For the Favor of the Public," American Druggist, 124: 45, July, 1951.

89. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: Pharmacy's Number One Problem," American Druggist, 143: 9, April 3, 1961; "Straight Talk: Most Serious Threat of All," American Druggist, 142: 9-10, July 11, 1960.

the state and federal courts, and his province was encroached upon by machines;[90] pragmatists looked upon the decline of the profession as inevitable. Dan Rennick, in a number of "Straight Talk" editorials titled "Defeatist Talk Vs. the Facts" refuted most of the talk by suggesting that the pharmacist had an unfulfilled role in answering patrons' questions about health matters, checking the prescribing accuracy of the physician (particularly in regard to underdoses), emphasizing "complete prescription service" (versus that offered by some discounting operations), and giving proper verbal cautions to his patients.[91] Soon, other editors were following Rennick's lead: George B. Griffenhagen of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association urged suitable family prescription record systems upon his readers as "still another approach in expanded professional service which is the only road to pharmacy's professional survival."[92]

---

90. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: Pharmacy's Number One Problem," American Druggist, 143: 9, April 3, 1961; "Straight Talk: Enter the Machine Age," American Druggist, 143: 10, June 12, 1961.

91. Dan Rennick, "Straight Talk: Defeatist Talk Vs the Facts (18)," American Druggist, 148: 13-14, September 16, 1963; "Straight Talk: Defeatist Talk Vs the Facts (16)," American Druggist, 148: 13-14, August 19, 1963; "Straight Talk: Needed, A Definition of 'Complete Rx Service'," American Druggist, 146: 11-12, November 26, 1962; "Straight Talk: This Case Proves the Need for Verbal Cautions," American Druggist, 149: 9, June 4, 1964.

92. George B. Griffenhagen, "Horse-and-Buggy Days Are Over," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS4: 163, April, 1964.

A few editors became bogged down in the age-old controversy of whether or not pharmacy would fare better if its practice was entirely separated from commercial contagians and the pharmacist restricted merely to compounding and dispensing of prescriptions.[93] Irving Rubin, new editor of the American Professional Pharmacist believed the pharmaceutical utopia would arrive if pharmacists stocked new product literature for distribution to local physicians upon request and adopted a professional fee system of cahrging for their professional services, and again stressed that the first step was for pharmacists to feel that they were professional men.[94]

In August of 1962, the American Pharmaceutical Association launched its Public Relations Service, and the August number of the Journal publicized it to a turn. Editor George B. Griffenhagen offered the following definition of public relations:

---

93. Louis E. Kazin, "Let's Be Practical," Drug Topics, 107: 34, April 22, 1963; "What Degradation?," Drug Topics, 107: 30, December 2, 1963; Peter J. Sletterdahl, "The Search for a Utopia or an Elysium," N.A.R.D. Journal, 86: 14, March 2, 1964; "Professor Derides Community Pharmacists," N.A.R.D. Journal, 86: 16-17, August 17, 1964.

94. Irving Rubin, "You Can Boost Pharmacy's Prestige Simply by Mailing Me a Postcard," American Professional Pharmacist, 27: 17, 19, January, 1961; "What Is the Public's Image of Pharmacy?," American Professional Pharmacist, 27: 21, April, 1961.

> Public relations is the management function which evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies and procedures of an individual profession or organization with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding and acceptance.[95]

Griffenhagen then carefully discussed the definition, pointing out the importance of well-organized public relations programs at national, state, and local levels, of producing the proper identification--or image--of the pharmacist as a professional man, and not just a "good guy," of the difference between advertising campaigns "designed to push merchandise and increase customer values" and real public relations, and finally, the importance of a continual program of action:

> Public relations is not a part-time job, to be turned on when we find ourselves in difficulties and off when we have cleaned up the problems. Pharmacists must concentrate their time and efforts on keeping the pipelines of public information and education abundantly supplied with constructive reminders and facts that will enhance the correct image of pharmacy. These efforts must originate in their own community pharmacies through their daily personalized contacts with the public and active, grass-roots support of the organized public relations programs offered by

---

95. George B. Griffenhagen, "Definition: PR," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 461, August, 1962.

> their national, state and local pharmaceutical associations.[96]

Brilliantly conceived, well-planned, and swiftly executed with imaginative and thought-provoking material, it has remained somewhat of a mystery that the A.Ph.A. Public Relations Service was not as well-received as it might have been. The national-state-local concept of public relations has not yet been effectively developed, and the "grass-roots" support of which Griffenhagen wrote is still sadly missing. It may be that the costs for supporting a full-blown public relations program were not forthcoming at the state and local levels; it may be that pharmacists were hesitant to adopt methods and procedures which were inherently foreign to many of them; it may be that they just didn't care. But we suspect that the real reason that public relations programs received little or no attention from the pharmacist in the early 1960's was the very real competition for his time--the day-to-day responsibilities associated with the practice of pharmacy.[97]

---

96. Ibid.; also see George B. Griffenhagen, "The Truth Will Out," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS3: 411, August, 1963.

97. Louis E. Kazin, "Promotion Waste?," Drug Topics, 108: 44, September 21, 1964.

To sum up the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead in making certain the world as a whole and public opinion in particular clearly recognize the importance of pharmacy in modern health care it has been concluded that:

> The world in general, and legislation and public opinion, should take cognizance of what pharmacy really means. Thus becomes clear a rational basis for public recognition and protection of pharmacy to help assure the maintenance of professional vigor and creative spirit.[98]

---

98. Sonnedecker, History of Pharmacy, p. 328; also see George B. Griffenhagen, "Rational Basis for Public Recognition," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS4; 367, August, 1964.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY REMARKS

In Chapter I we presented several problems facing contemporary pharmacy and proposed that a content analysis of the editorial opinions expressed by the editors of six leading pharmaceutical journals during the first halves of the past five decades might provide some clues as to how and why these problems came about; it was also implied that a study of this sort, while not attempting to offer a solution to these problems, might at least clarify the complex pattern of events and ideas within which the problems developed.

Our first objective concerned itself with the development of a suitable methodology for the content analysis of professional journals, and, indeed, the main thrust of this study has been methodological. We feel that the methodology presented in Chapter II, although experimental, is basically sound, and subsequent work with the material collected in the sample following the proposed procedure proved entirely satisfactory. The sample, although large, was not unwieldy, and the method employed for drawing it, although perhaps academically inelegant, was adequate and, what is more important, valid. The technique of sampling--

based on months--avoided a tiresome enumeration of the universe for each journal required in some sampling procedures. The sampling convention employed which avoided "bunching" of the sample (q.v.) also provided a ready-made split-half sample, as one-half of the months in the sample were drawn from each half of every year sampled; this may be a useful technique to employ in subsequent studies of sampling variability, since the sample may be split into the first six months of the year and the second six months by one pass of the prepared IBM cards through a card-sorter, as well as being split randomly.

The choice of the particular journals used in the content analysis encompassed by this study appears to have been wisely made; upon careful inspection of the more than eighty subject classifications which were developed, we feel that no important general area of concern in American pharmacy was neglected due to the restrictive scope of any of the journals chosen; in fact, the wide breadth of the subject matter gathered seems to indicate just the opposite.

The modern techniques employed in preparing the material for a content analysis (editorials, in this case from the sample of months randomly chosen) must again be stressed. The essentially binary bibliographic identification code developed at this point (see Appendix A) was planned to be suitable for subsequent analysis by a computer. Although a computer was not used in this study, we believe that future researchers in this or related areas

would do well to provide for this eventuality at an early stage of their work to avoid methodological backtracking. The codes were applied to the sample of months on a set of sample cards both prior to and during the initial inspection step, as described in Chapter II. This procedure seems entirely satisfactory, and allows minor adjustments to be made to the coding system, if necessary. At this point, if one were definitely planning to use a computer, it would be advisable to code directly upon machine-scored answer sheets or special grids developed for key-punch operators. The flexibility and convenience introduced at this point by the Xeroxing of all editorials encountered in the sample cannot be overemphasized; indeed, we feel that without the use of such a technique, a study of this scope would have been prohibitive in terms of the time required to carry it through properly for a Master's degree requirement of reasonable dimensions.

Chapter III traced the history and development of the six journals chosen for this study, with emphasis upon the changes in format and editorial character. Prior historical work on several of the journals--the American Journal of Pharmacy,[1] the American Professional Pharmacist (nee,

---

1. Ivor Griffith, "American Journal of Pharmacy," in First Century of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 1821-1921 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, 1922), pp. 278-281.

The Practical Druggist),[2] the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association,[3] and the American Druggist[4]--was verified, corrected, if necessary, and brought up to date; a literature search with regard to the other two journals--the N.A.R.D. Journal and Drug Topics--was not fruitful, and much of the material presented in these sections is brought together here for the first time. More work needs to be done on the intra- and inter-relationships within and among these journals; the genealogies developed for each of the journals (q.v.) should prove useful in this regard.[5]

---

2. Madeline Oxford Holland, "The Development of a Pharmaceutical Journal--the American Professional Pharmacist" (paper presented at the third joint session of the American Institute of the History of Pharmacy and the American Pharmaceutical Association Section on Historical Pharmacy [at the invitation of the A.I.H.P.], Salt Lake City, Utah, August 21, 1953). Typescript in Kremers Historical Reference Files, Madison, Wisconsin; also see: H. S. Baketel, "Twenty-five Years in Drug Journalism," The Practical Druggist and Pharmaceutical Review of Reviews, 40: 23-26, January, 1922.

3. Glenn Sonnedecker, "The Journal Is Born," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 744-745, 776-777, December, 1961; "Guides to the Journal's Destiny," ibid., pp. 746-748.

4. Glenn Sonnedecker, Kremers and Urdang's History of Pharmacy (third edition) (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1963), pp. 260-261.

5. Also see: Herbert C. Kassner, "This Is How We Learn," American Druggist, 88: 98-99, 270, 272, 276, 278, 280, 284, October, 1933; Minnie M. Meyer, "The Pharmaceutical Journals of the United States," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Scientific Edition), 22: 424-429, May, 1933; Minnie M. Meyer, "The Pharmaceutical Journals of the United States," (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1934); Frederick Hoffman, "A Century of American Pharmaceutical Literature and Journalism," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 36: 159-165, March 26, 1900, cited by Sonnedecker, loc. cit.

The second objective--that of describing and analyzing trends in editorial coverage during the period 1920 through 1964--was accomplished in a quantitative sense in Chapters IV and V, the former covering apparent trends in editorial opinion over the five five-year periods considered, the latter describing the trends manifest within each journal during every period. These trends need not be reiterated at this point, but their usefulness in future socio-economic or historical research should be noted. Admittedly, rather primitive statistical procedures--counting and percentaging--were used in these analyses; to have done more would have been beyond the scope of this study. The validity of the trends noted rests solely upon the validity of the sampling procedure; however, we feel that the size of the sample and the manner in which it was collected attests to its validity. A more sophisticated statistical approach to the problem would require the use of a computer.

The third objective of this study, to compare and contrast editorial opinions on certain selected topics during the defined time span, was attempted in Chapters VI through VIII.

By referring the reader of these three chapters to appropriate tables elsewhere in the study, we hoped that the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the research might be associated, for it was implicit in their writing that if no editorials on a particular subject appeared during a particular period, this fact need not be stated.

The general conclusions which may be drawn from the three chapters--that the editors were generally in favor of an increased amount of pharmaceutical education, collegiate as well as the practical (internship) and continuing varieties, albeit some dragged their feet; that the editors favored the principle of federation in pharmacy, although some were so involved in forwarding their own cause that they could not conceive of a plan suitable to anyone else; that very few of the editors in the sample had a mature concept of public relations principles which could be applied to enhance the stature of pharmacy in the public's eyes--are not startling, and doubtless our readers can draw many others. We feel that the results obtained by the objective technique of content analysis strongly outweighs any subjective feelings or opinions which the reader may hold on these topics developed by a cursory inspection of editorials in pharmaceutical journals. Our sample of editorials was chosen in a random, unbiased manner and discussed in the same proportions in which they appeared in the sample. The contrasts, comparisons, and tentative conclusions were made on this basis, and if any gaps appear in the presentation, it is because we were obliged not to stray from our methodology once it had been established.

We may dare suggest that the technique of content analysis as applied to editorial content perhaps has, under certain circumstances, as much to recommend to the historian as to the sociologist: By the use of the sampling

techniques herein described (or similar ones), the historian may be assured that the content which he wishes to explore has indeed been fairly chosen and unbiased, and that any bias which may creep in can be explained by his presentation; or he may choose to use the technique of content analysis as a springboard for an in-depth historical study; by the same token, the sociologist may profit from the historical richness inherent in a content analysis over a long period of time, and incorporate this feeling into his work, thus hopefully avoiding any shallowness.

It was not intended (nor was it possible) to fully analyze all of the material drawn in our sample; we chose three topics in which we had a particular interest and which we felt were relevant and amenable to analysis. It is realized that each of the topics in Chapters VI through VIII could constitute a thesis in itself, however, our purpose was not so much to present historical material, interesting as it may be, but to dramatize the use of the technique of content analysis in the sociological study of editorial opinion. We feel we have achieved this lesser goal. It is also realized that other researchers may wish to replicate or continue our work, and for this reason our sample is being made available to them for this purpose.*

---

*In the Kremers Historical Reference Files, University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

From our reading and understanding of the several thousand editorials contained in this study, we would suggest that until recently, American pharmacy seems to have been operating in a microcosm, albeit with some--and ever-increasing--outside influences; events in the past few decades, such as increased government intervention and regulation, indifferent interprofessional relations, shaky public relations, the lack of one voice for pharmacy, and others have shown this to be an unwise procedure to follow.

The number of pharmacists in the United States is small enough that one would presumably be able to reach them through the printed word rather easily; we do not believe this to be the case, however. Of the six journals included in this study, only two--the American Druggist and Drug Topics--have an unrestricted distribution.* The American Journal of Pharmacy, essentially a college publication, restricts itself to a distribution of only a few thousand; the American Professional Pharmacist, until recently, has been sent only to certain hospital and professional pharmacy segments of the profession and to some pharmaceutical educators; the readership of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the N.A.R.D. Journal is largely contingent upon membership in their associated

---

*Distributed free of charge to pharmacies in the United States.

organizations.

Readership studies of these journals should be undertaken to ascertain which journals are read and by whom they are read; subsequently, a study might be able to determine how pharmacists form their opinions on matters pertaining to pharmacy, and what role the pharmaceutical journal editorial has in forming these opinions.

On the other hand, it might be safely assumed that most of the acknowledged leaders in pharmacy--pharmacy educators, association officials, at the national, state, and local level, state board of pharmacy members and officials, and related governmental officials--read most of these six publications regularly. Similar studies to the ones mentioned above could bear out this contention, which would conceivably affect the status of the pharmaceutical journal editor as an opinion leader to a marked extent.

We feel that the role of the pharmaceutical journal editor as an opinion leader not only to the profession of pharmacy but also to the leaders in pharmacy is a critical area for future sociological research. It is our feeling that the pharmaceutical journal editor has generally merely interpreted current events affecting pharmacy to his readers, helping them to form their own opinions or forcing his own particular views upon them; in both cases, the editor may be seen as an opinion leader; in the latter

case, however, we personally feel the editor has little place, and belligerent attempts in this regard have usually met with failure.

Only continued research in this area can bear out or refute this contention. For if we can understand the process by which pharmacists and pharmacy leaders form their opinions on matters concerning their profession, then we have taken the first big step toward forming a united front for pharmacy on the governmental, interprofessional, social, and economic battlelines and toward breaking out from the microcosm within which pharmacy has been so long confined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES CITED

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES CITED

Books

Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis in Communications Research. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952.

Bernays, Edward L. Public Relations. Boston: Bellman Publishing Company, 1945.

Blauch, Lloyd E., and George L. Webster. The Pharmaceutical Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.

Cattell, Jaques (ed.). American Men of Science: The Physical and Biological Sciences. Tenth edition. 4 vols. Tempe, Arizona: Jaques Cattell Press, Inc., 1961.

Cutlip, Scott M., and Allen H. Center. Effective Public Relations. Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Elliott, Edward C. The General Report of the Pharmaceutical Survey 1946-49. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950.

England, Joseph W. (ed.). First Century of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 1821-1921. Philadelphia: Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, 1922.

Griffith, Ivor. "American Journal of Pharmacy," in First Century of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 1821-1921. Philadelphia: Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, 1922.

Hart, Hornell. "Changing Social Attitudes and Interests," in Recent Social Trends in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933.

Hull, William H. Public Relations for the Pharmacist. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1955.

Kriegbaum, Hillier. Facts in Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

Lasswell, Harold, Nathan Leites, et al. The Language of Politics. New York: George W. Stewart, 1949.

MacDougall, Curtis. The Press and Its Problems. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc., 1964.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. Kremers and Urdang's History of Pharmacy. Third edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1963.

Stieb, Ernst W. The American Institute of the History of Pharmacy--Through Two Decades. Madison, Wisconsin: American Institute of the History of Pharmacy, 1961.

Walker, Helen M., and Joseph Lev. Elementary Statistical Methods. Revised edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1952.

Willey, Malcolm M. The Country Newspaper. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1926.

Periodicals

American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties. "By-Laws of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties," Proceedings of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, 7 (1906), pp. 44-46.

Apple, William S. "Dr. Apple Accepts Secretaryship," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 20: 9 (September, 1959), p. 500.

Arny, H. V. "The Cleveland Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 9 (September, 1922), p. 663.

Austin, E. C. "Training Hospital Pharmacists," The Druggist's Circular, 65: 3 (March, 1921), p. 87.

Baketel, H. S. "Twenty-five Years in Drug Journalism," The Practical Druggist and Pharmaceutical Review of Reviews, 40: 1 (January, 1922), pp. 23-26.

Bartlett, Kenneth G. "Trends in Radio Programs," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 213 (1941), pp. 15-25.

Beal, J. H. "The Policy of the Journal," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 1 (January, 1912), pp. 1-3.

Beal, James H. "The President's Address," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 1 (January, 1906), pp. 3-14.

Bender, George A.(?). "Congratulations," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 15 (August 2, 1934), p. 796.

Bender, George A.(?). "N.A.R.D. and A.Ph.A.," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 16 (August 16, 1934), p. 848.

Bender, George A.(?). "Our Convention--an American Privilege," N.A.R.D. Journal, 62: 18 (September 19, 1940), p. 1331.

Bender, George A.(?). "We Are Privileged to Meet," N.A.R.D. Journal, 64: 19 (October 1, 1942), p. 1307.

Bender, George A.(?). "You Must 'Deliver'," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 20 (October 18, 1934), p. 1106.

Beringer, George M. "The Faults of Medical Education," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 3 (March, 1920), pp. 145-146.

Beringer, George M. "Meeting of the A.Ph.A. Executive Committee," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 2 (February, 1920), pp. 77-81.

Beringer, George M. "The Sixty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association," American Journal of Pharmacy, 92: 6 (June, 1920), pp. 359-360.

Beringer, George M. "To Work for One's Profession, A Duty," American Journal of Pharmacy, 96: 11 (November, 1920), pp. 767-769.

Berman, Alex. "The Formative Period: The Advance In the Thirties," The Bulletin (of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists), 9: 4 (July-August, 1952), pp. 293-298.

Berman, Alex. "The Formative Period: The Awakening In the Twenties," The Bulletin (of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists), 9: 4 (July-August, 1952), pp. 288-292.

Bernays, Edward L. "The Bernays Drug and Pharmaceutical Survey," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Scientific Edition), 32: 12 (December, 1943), pp. 368-374.

Bernays, Edward L. "What's Wrong With Pharmacy?," American Druggist, 108: 4 (October, 1943), pp. 48, 100, 103-104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 164, 166.

Breese, Murray(?), "New Times, New Conditions, New Needs and a New American Druggist," American Druggist, 76: 1 (July, 1927), p. 11.

Carr, Charles M. "Genesis of the Journal of the N.A.R.D.," The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists, 17: 13 (January 1, 1914), pp. 777-780.

Castle, Frederick A.(?). "Ourselves," American Druggist, 13: 1 (January, 1884), pp. 10-11.

Christensen, H. C. "Why an American Pharmacy Building Is Needed," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 5 (May, 1924), pp. 397-398.

"Conference of Professional Pharmacists," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 28: 11 (November, 1939), pp. 938-939.

Craig, Hugh. "Salutory," The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists, 17: 14 (January 8, 1914), p. 833.

Dargavel, John W.(?), "All for One...and One for All," N.A.R.D. Journal, 62: 11 (May 16, 1940), p. 671.

Dargavel, John W.(?). "The Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 19 (October 4, 1934), p. 1052.

Dargavel, John W.(?). "Don't Scuttle the Ship!," N.A.R.D. Journal, 65: 14 (July 19, 1943), p. 1112.

Dargavel, John W. "Editorially Speaking," N.A.R.D. Journal, 64: 16 (August 20, 1942), p. 1083.

Dargavel, John W. "Editorially Speaking," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 14 (July 17, 1944), p. 1233.

Dargavel, John W. "Fischelis of the A.Ph.A. Aligns Himself With Manufacturers Against N.A.R.D. Bill," N.A.R.D. Journal, 73: 11 (June 4, 1951), pp. 208, 826, 830, 832, 834, 836.

Dargavel, John W. "For a Greater Journal," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 15 (August 3, 1933), p. 634.

Dargavel, John W. "For Better Professional Service," N.A.R.D. Journal, 62: 2 (January 18, 1940), p. 97.

Dargavel, John W.(?). "Forging Ahead in '44," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 1 (January 3, 1944), p. 19.

Dargavel, John W. "Government Recognition," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 16 (August 24, 1933), p. 682.

Dargavel, John W. "Late Hours," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 16 (August 24, 1933), p. 682.

Dargavel, John W. "Misguided and Weasel Opposition," N.A.R.D. Journal, 72: 19 (October 2, 1950), p. 1499.

Dargavel, John W. "Obstructive Confusion Compounded," N.A.R.D. Journal, 72: 22 (November 20, 1950), p. 1835.

Dargavel, John W. "Self-preservation," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 15 (August 3, 1933), p. 633.

Dargavel, John W. "To Live and Help To Live," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 16 (August 21, 1944), p. 1391.

Dargavel, John W. "Today's Opportunities," N.A.R.D. Journal, 63: 3 (February 6, 1941), p. 163.

Dargavel, John W. "Undeveloped Power," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 16 (August 17, 1933), p. 682.

Dargavel, John W.(?), "Victory for Pharmacy," N.A.R.D. Journal, 65: 19 (October 4, 1943), p. 1467.

Dargavel, John W.(?). "Which Do YOU Desire?," N.A.R.D. Journal, 56: 15 (August 2, 1934), p. 795.

Dargavel, John W. "Your Responsibility," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 16 (August 17, 1933), p. 681.

Diehl, C. Lewis. "Report on the Progress of Pharmacy," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 32 (1884), pp. 25-31.

"Drug Topics Gets Support of Top Firms," Drug Topics, 105: 24 (November 20, 1961), p. 2.

"Drug Topics' New Editor Is Dr. Swain," Drug Topics, 55: 7 (February 13, 1939), pp. 2, 16.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Abuse of the Word 'Drug'," The Practical Druggist, 40: 2 (February, 1922), p. 15.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Activities of State Associations," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 49: 7 (July, 1931), p. 10.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "The All Pharmacy Headquarters Campaign," The Practical Druggist, 42: 9 (September, 1924), pp. 13-14.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "The A.Ph.A. Headquarters Campaign," The Practical Druggist, 42: 6 (June, 1924), p. 15.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Changes in Pharmacy Laws," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 49: 1 (January, 1931), p. 12.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Drug Store Experience," The Practical Druggist, 40: 10 (October, 1924), pp. 13-14.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Help for the Pharmacist," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 48: 10 (October, 1930), p. 12.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Increasing Requirements in Pharmacy," The Practical Druggist, 40: 12 (December, 1922), p. 15.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Let Us Talk Sense," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 52: 11 (November, 1934), p. 27.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "The N.A.R.D. Meeting at Boston," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 50: 8 (August, 1932), p. 8.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Prescription Departments--Open or Closed," The Practical Druggist and Spatula, 52: 9 (September, 1934), p. 39.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "The State Meetings," The Practical Druggist, 40: 7 (July, 1922), p. 13.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "To Acquaint the Public," The Practical Druggist, 41: 9 (September, 1923), p. 16.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "To More Thoroughly Organize American Pharmacy," The Practical Druggist, 41: 4 (April, 1923), p. 15.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Your State Meeting," The Practical Druggist, 40: 6 (June, 1922), p. 16.

Dyer, Reginald E.(?). "Your State Meeting," The Practical Druggist, 41: 6 (June, 1923), p. 14.

Eberle, E. G. "Agencies for Increasing the Usefulness and Efficiency of Pharmaceutical Endeavor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 10 (October, 1930), p. 1048.

Eberle, E. G. "The Application of Right Principles Is Essential to Effect Right Relations," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 8 (August, 1930), pp. 809-810.

Eberle, E. G. "Association Meetings," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 4 (April, 1931), pp. 311-312.

Eberle, E. G. "Bringing About a Better Understanding of Pharmacy by the Public," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 7 (July, 1923), p. 574.

Eberle, E. G. "Commencements," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 6 (June, 1922), pp. 406-407.

Eberle, E. G. "Coördinated Endeavor of Pharmaceutical Associations," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 9 (September, 1922), pp. 667-668.

Eberle, E. G. "Coördinating Pharmacal and Medical Endeavor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 4 (April, 1921), pp. 244-245.

Eberle, E. G. "A Deduction from Lord Kelvin's Centenary Applied to Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 8 (August, 1924), pp. 689-690.

Eberle, E. G. "Drug Treatment: Past, Present and Future," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 12 (December, 1923), pp. 1051-52.

Eberle, E. G. "The Editorship of the Journal," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 4: 5 (May, 1915), pp. 605-6.

Eberle, E. G. "Entrance Requirements of Schools and Colleges of Pharmacy and Their Matriculants," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 10 (October, 1922), pp. 773-774.

Eberle, E. G. "Extending the Service of the House of Delegates," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 10 (October, 1921), pp. 729-731.

Eberle, E. G. "The Going and the Coming Year," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 12 (December, 1922), pp. 993-994.

Eberle, E. G. "Higher Association Dues," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association," 9: 10 (October, 1920), p. 944.

Eberle, E. G. "Individuality and Responsibility," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 11 (November, 1933), p. 1076.

Eberle, E. G. "Influences that Promote Endeavor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 1 (January, 1932), pp. 6-7.

Eberle, E. G. "Misapplied Benefits Result in Evil," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 8 (August, 1924), pp. 688-689.

Eberle, E. G. "The Mother of American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 10 (October, 1932), p. 993.

Eberle, E. G. "The National Drug Trade Conference," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 1 (January, 1923), pp. 6-7.

Eberle, E. G. "1932," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 1 (January, 1932), pp. 5-6.

Eberle, E. G. "None of Us Liveth to Himself," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 8 (August, 1920), pp. 759-760.

Eberle, E. G. "The NRA May Stress the Druggists' Responsibilities and Point to the Way for Improving Drug Store Practice," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 23: 3 (March, 1934), pp. 180-181.

Eberle, E. G. "Pharmaceutical Education and Development," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 6 (June, 1921), pp. 412-413.

Eberle, E. G. "Popularizing the Pharmacist," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 10 (October, 1924), p. 286.

Eberle, E. G. "Progressive Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 11 (October, 1921), pp. 824-825.

Eberle, E. G. "'The Quality of Men in Pharmacy of First Importance'," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19: 9 (September, 1930), pp. 936-938.

Eberle, E. G. "Reëducation of Pharmacists," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 12 (December, 1922), p. 994.

Eberle, E. G. "Reorganization of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 4 (April, 1922), pp. 243-244.

Eberle, E. G. "Reorganization of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 6 (June, 1922), p. 608.

Eberle, E. G. "The Restriction of the Sale of Medicines to Those Qualified by Education and Training," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 2 (February, 1933), pp. 88-89.

Eberle, E. G. "Standardization of Pharmacy Schools," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 3 (March, 1923), pp. 198-199.

Eberle, E. G. "The Trend of Pharmacy in Its Relation to the Public," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 12 (December, 1931), pp. 1260-1261.

Eberle, E. G. "Vocational Training and Education," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 12 (December, 1924), pp. 1106-1107.

Eberle, E. G. "The Washington Pharmaceutical Meetings," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 5 (May, 1920), pp. 466-468.

England, J. W. "A.Ph.A. Council Letter No. 27," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 6: 7 (July, 1911), p. 321.

England, J. W. "Minutes of the Second Session of the New Council," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 58: (1910), pp. 517-519.

England, J. W. "Supplemental Report of the Committee on Bulletin," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 58 (1910), pp. 509-510.

Fischelis, Robert P. "A.Ph.A. Branches Unite in Founders' Day Program," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 10 (October, 1952), pp. 700-701.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Cooperation," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 12 (December, 1954), p. 754.

Fischelis, Robert P. "A Dangerous Procedure," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 11: 10 (October, 1950), pp. 601, 624.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Dr. Martin Becomes Editor," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 17: 4 (April, 1956), p. 219.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Eisenhower Has the Answer," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 14: 11 (November, 1953), pp. 694-695.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Let Us Not Surrender Our Professional Freedom," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 2 (February, 1952), pp.96-97.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Professionalism Remains the Backbone of Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 9 (September, 1951), p. 403.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Remember the Declaration of Independence," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 12: 7 (July, 1951), pp. 402-403.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Substitution Must Be Defined," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 13: 11 (November, 1952), pp. 772-773.

Fischelis, Robert P. "Valedictory," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 20: 9 (September, 1959), pp. 502-503.

Gane, E. H.(?). "In the Interest of the Clerk," Drug Topics, 30: 12 (December, 1915), pp. 1-2.

Goode, John A. "A Message from the President Concerning the Financial Condition of the National Association of Retail Druggists," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 10 (May 18, 1933), pp. 421-430.

Goode, John A. "A Statement by the President, John A. Goode," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 12 (June 15, 1933), pp. 508-510.

Griffenhagen, George B. "The Courage of Making a Choice," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS3: 11 (November, 1963), p. 557.

Griffenhagen, George B. "Definition: PR," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 8 (August, 1962), p. 461.

"Guides to the Journal's Destiny," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 12 (December, 1961), pp. 746-748.

Griffenhagen, George B. "Fifty Years of Representation," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 3 (March, 1962), p. 141.

Griffenhagen, George B.(?). "For, By, and Of Pharmacists," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 3 (March, 1961), p. 147.

Griffenhagen, George B. "Horse-and-Buggy Days Are Over," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS4: 4 (April, 1964), p. 163.

Griffenhagen, George B. "Rational Basis for Public Recognition," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS4: 8 (August, 1964), p. 367.

Griffenhagen, George B. "Too Many Organizations...Or Too Little Organization?," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS2: 1 (January, 1962), p. 11.

Griffenhagen, George B. "The Truth Will Out," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS3: 8 (August, 1963), p. 411.

Griffith, Ivor. "The Master Formula--Honor, Integrity, and Trustworthiness," American Journal of Pharmacy, 98: 10 (October, 1922), pp. 625-626.

Henry, Samuel C. "The A.Ph.A. Meeting," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 16 (July 14, 1921), p. 646.

Henry, Samuel C. "The Big Convention Now On," N.A.R.D. Journal, 50: 25 (September 18, 1930), pp. 1029-1030.

Henry, Samuel C. "The Big Event," N.A.R.D. Journal, 53: 1 (October 1, 1931), pp. 5-6.

Henry, Samuel C. "The Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 23 (September 4, 1924), pp. 921-922.

Henry, Samuel C. "Convention Proceedings," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 2 (October 12, 1922), p. 48.

Henry, Samuel C. "Convention Resolutions," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 15 (July 14, 1921), p. 597.

Henry, Samuel C. "Druggists and the Dope Traffic," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 25 (March 22, 1923), pp. 1057-1059.

Henry, Samuel C. "Druggists Assailed," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 22 (March 1, 1923), pp. 929-930.

Henry, Samuel C. "Fair Play," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 10 (December 7, 1922), pp. 437-438.

Henry, Samuel C. "Governmental Regulations," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 17 (July 29, 1920), pp. 741-742, 748.

Henry, Samuel C. "Important Meeting of the Executive Committee," N.A.R.D. Journal, 34: 4 (April 27, 1922), pp. 125-127.

Henry, Samuel C. "An Invitation," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 14 (July 7, 1921), p. 550.

Henry, Samuel C. "Maligning the Drug Trade," N.A.R.D. Journal, 37: 25 (March 20, 1924), pp. 1037-1038.

Henry, Samuel C. "More About the Pharmacopoeial Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 9 (June 3, 1920), pp. 391-392.

Henry, Samuel C. "The N.A.R.D.," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 6 (May 12, 1921), p. 237.

Henry, Samuel C. "N.A.R.D. Audit," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 10 (May 18, 1933), pp. 405-406.

Henry, Samuel C. "N.A.R.D. Outlook," N.A.R.D. Journal, 33: 1 (October 6, 1921), pp. 5-6.

Henry, Samuel C. "N.A.R.D. Washington (D.C.) Office," N.A.R.D. Journal, 53: 10 (December 3, 1931), p. 398.

Henry, Samuel C. "The National Drug Trade Congerence," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 11 (December 14, 1922), pp. 485-486.

Henry, Samuel C. "Nearing the Great Event," N.A.R.D. Journal, 52: 25 (September 17, 1931), pp. 757-758.

Henry, Samuel C. "Opinions Sought," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 24 (September 11, 1924), pp. 1053-1054.

Henry, Samuel C. "Organized Pharmacy Progressing," N.A.R.D. Journal, 34: 2 (April 12, 1922), pp. 49-50.

Henry, Samuel C. "Our Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 13 (June 26, 1924), p. 506.

Henry, Samuel C. "Our Slogan," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 14 (January 4, 1923), p. 602.

Henry, Samuel C. "An Outstanding Event," N.A.R.D. Journal, 52: 24 (September 10, 1931), pp. 921-922.

Henry, Samuel C. "Personality the Keystone," N.A.R.D. Journal, 53: 1 (October 1, 1931), p. 6.

Henry, Samuel C. "Publicity for Pharmacy," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 11 (December 14, 1922), pp. 486-487.

Henry, Samuel C. "The Recent Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 54: 19 (October 6, 1932), pp. 881-882.

Henry, Samuel C. "Reduced Fares," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 22 (September 2, 1920), p. 991.

Henry, Samuel C. "Reduced Rates for the Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 36: 18 (August 2, 1923), pp. 705-706.

Henry, Samuel C. "Retail Trade Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 39: 7 (November 13, 1924), p. 302.

Henry, Samuel C. "The St. Louis Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 14 (July 8, 1920), pp. 613-614.

Henry, Samuel C. "Sam Henry Says," American Druggist, 92: 3 (September, 1935), pp. 44, 74, 77.

Henry, Samuel C. "Secretary Henry Retires as Editor of the Journal," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 12 (June 15, 1933), p. 506.

Henry, Samuel C. "State Association Activities," N.A.R.D. Journal, 34: 3 (April 20, 1922), pp. 85-86.

Henry, Samuel C. "State Conventions," N.A.R.D. Journal, 37: 18 (January 31, 1924), p. 746.

Henry, Samuel C. "State Pharmaceutical Associations," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 8 (May 26, 1921), p. 318.

Henry, Samuel C. "A Successful Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 1 (October 5, 1922), pp. 5-6.

Henry, Samuel C. "Try the Drug Store First," N.A.R.D. Journal, 35: 11 (December 14, 1922), p. 487.

Henry, Samuel C. "An Unwarranted Attack," N.A.R.D. Journal, 55: 8 (April 20, 1933), pp. 317-319.

Henry, Samuel C. "Washington Invites You," N.A.R.D. Journal, 38: 17 (July 24, 1924), pp. 673-674.

Henry, Samuel C. "What's the Answer?," N.A.R.D. Journal, 32: 21 (August 25, 1921), pp. 833-834.

Henry, Samuel C. "Your Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 54: 17 (September 1, 1932), pp. 745-746.

Henry, Samuel C. "A Wonderful Convention," N.A.R.D. Journal, 30: 26 (September 30, 1920), pp. 1213-1215.

Hoffman, Frederick. "A Century of American Pharmaceutical Literature and Journalism," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 36: 6 (March 26, 1900), pp. 159-165.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "The American Professional Pharmacist," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 1 (January, 1952), p. 33.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "A.Ph.A.," American Professional Pharmacist, 16: 4 (April, 1950), p. 335.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 11 (November, 1953), p. 895.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Association Meetings," American Professional Pharmacist, 17: 9 (September, 1951), pp. 799, 834.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Canada Views the Refill Controversy," American Professional Pharmacist, 17: 5 (May, 1951), p. 425.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Counterfeit Drugs," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 11 (November, 1954), p. 1041.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Enrollments in Colleges," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 1 (January, 1953), p. 21.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Extension Programs," American Professional Pharmacist, 26: 6 (June, 1960), pp. 367, 400.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Independent Profession," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 11 (November, 1953), p. 893.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Personality," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 10 (October, 1952), p. 875.

Holland, Madeline Oxford(?), "Preceptorship," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 5 (May, 1952), p. 417.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Prescription Fees and Public Relations," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 7 (July, 1954), pp. 617, 694.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Professional Designation--R.P.," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 3 (March, 1954), p. 237.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Public Attitudes on the Cost of Drugs," American Professional Pharmacist, 19: 5 (May, 1953), p. 373.

Holland, Madeline Oxford(?). "Rutgers Extension Service," American Professional Pharmacist, 16: 4 (April, 1950), p. 337.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "State Associations," American Professional Pharmacist, 20: 3 (March, 1954), pp. 239, 281.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Substitution and Imitation," American Professional Pharmacist, 18: 8 (August, 1952), p. 691.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "Unified Organization," American Professional Pharmacist, 26: 8 (August, 1960), p. 485.

Hunsberger, Ambrose. "Constructive Efforts in Behalf of American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 9 (September, 1922), pp. 666-667.

Hutchins, Harold W. "Doing Business in the Name of Pharmacy," American Druggist, 106: 3 (September, 1942), p. 17.

Hynson, H. P. "Pharmaceutical Journals," Pharmaceutical Review, 22 (September, 1904), pp. 353-355.

"Jerry McQuade Is Dead at 63," Drug Topics, 54: 46 (November 14, 1938), pp. 1, 14-15.

Jordan, C. B. "Address of the Chairman of the House of Delegates," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 8 (August, 1931), pp. 812-816.

Kassner, Herbert C. "This Is How We Learn," American Druggist, 88: 4 (October, 1933), pp. 98-99, 270, 272, 276, 278, 280, 284.

Kazin, Louis E.(?). "College Seminars," Drug Topics, 104:: 23 (November 7, 1960), p. 40.

Kazin, Louis E. "Let's Be Practical," Drug Topics, 107: 8 (April 22, 1963), p. 34.

Kazin, Louis E. "Promotion Waste!," Drug Topics, 108: 19 (September 21, 1964), p. 44.

Kazin, Louis E. "Too Much Emotion," Drug Topics, 107: 16 (August 12, 1963), p. 46.

Kazin, Louis E. "What Degradation?," Drug Topics, 107: 24 (December 2, 1963), p. 30.

Kelly, E. F.(?). "Education in Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 1: 1 (January, 1940), pp. 4-5.

Kelly, E. F. "Readjustment of A.Ph.A. Activities for Better and Greater Service of American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 11: 9 (September, 1922), pp. 664-666.

Kelly, E. F. "The Toronto Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 21: 9 (September, 1932), pp. 845-848.

Kelly, E. F. and John W. Dargavel. "Report on Historic A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D. Conference," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 12 (December, 1943), pp. 394-399.

Kelly, E. F. and A. C. DuMez. "The Scientific and Practical Pharmacy Editions of the Journal," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 1: 1 (January, 1940), pp. 1-4.

Kilmer, Fred B. "The Cap and Gown in Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 104: 3 (March, 1932), pp. 168-169.

Kilmer, Fred B. "The Price of a Prescription," American Journal of Pharmacy, 104: 11 (November, 1932), pp. 702-704.

Kilmer, Fred B. "Technocracy and the Drug Store," American Journal of Pharmacy, 105: 3 (March, 1933), pp. 95-98.

Kilmer, Fred B. "Today and Tomorrow in Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 103: 10 (October, 1931), pp. 543-548.

Kramer, John E. "Ivor Griffith: 1891-1961," American Journal of Pharmacy: 133: 6 (June, 1961), pp. 208-210.

Kremers, Edward. "Report of Committee on President's Address," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 1 (January, 1906), pp. 15-16.

Lyman, Rufus A. "The Editor's Page," American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 7: 4 (October, 1943), pp. 574-575.

McCloskey, John F. "Post-war Customers," N.A.R.D. Journal, 66: 2 (January 17, 1944), p. 91.

McDonnell, John N. "The Bell Tolls," American Professional Pharmacist, 8: 3 (March, 1942), pp. 150, 196.

McDonnell, John N. "Commercial," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 9 (September, 1940), p. 553.

McDonnell, John N.(?). "Cooperation," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 3 (March, 1940), p. 151.

McDonnell, John N. "Extension Pharmacy," American Professional Pharmacist, 7: 5 (May, 1941),p. 291.

McDonnell, John N. "On the March," American Professional Pharmacist, 8: 11 (November, 1942), p. 691.

McDonnell, John N. "Professional," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 5 (May, 1940), p. 287.

McDonnell, John N.(?). "Random Thoughts," American Professional Pharmacist, 9: 12 (December, 1943), p. 785.

McDonnell, John E. "Recognition," American Professional Pharmacist, 10: 3 (March, 1944), p. 169.

McDonnell, John N. "Respect," American Professional Pharmacist, 7: 8 (August, 1941), p. 491.

McDonnell, John N.(?). "Retraining of Veterans," American Professional Pharmacist, 9: 12 (December, 1943), p. 783.

McDonnell, John N. "A Solution in Complexity," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 8 (August, 1940), p. 487.

McDonnell, John N. "Trust Not To Outward Show," American Professional Pharmacist, 6: 8 (August, 1940), pp. 485, 498.

McDonnell, John N.(?). "Welcome to 6,000 Pharmacists," American Professional Pharmacist, 11: 10 (October, 1945),p. 907.

McDonnell, John N. "What Is a Prescription?," American Professional Pharmacist, 9: 3 (March, 1943), p. 155.

McDonnell, John N. "What Is Pharmacy Going to Do?," American Professional Pharmacist, 7: 5 (May, 1941), p. 289.

McPherrin, John W. "Add...'For the Dignity of Pharmacy'," American Druggist, 108: 4 (October, 1943), p. 43.

McPherrin, John W. "For the Favor of the Public," American Druggist, 124: 1 (July, 1951), p. 45.

McPherrin, John W. "Good News for Pharmacy!," American Druggist, 107: 5 (May, 1943), p. 29.

McPherrin, John W. "An Open Letter to E. Walton Bobet," American Druggist, 108: 1 (January, 1944), p. 39.

McPherrin, John W. "This Drug Business," American Druggist, 124: 3 (September, 1951), p. 182.

McQuade, Jerry, "By Popular Choice," Drug Topics, 50: 32 (August 13, 1931), p. 14.

McQuade, Jerry. "Drug Topics Becomes a Newspaper," Drug Topics, 50: 1 (January 8, 1934), p. 30.

McQuade, Jerry. "15-Minute Closing," Drug Topics, 50: 12 (March 26, 1934), p. 14.

McQuade, Jerry. "A Grave Responsibility; A Plan for Action," Drug Topics, 50: 32 (September 24, 1934), p. 18.

McQuade, Jerry. "How the N.A.R.D. Worked Out Its Code," Drug Topics, 49: 8 (August, 1933), pp. 39-43ff.

McQuade, Jerry(?). "Now the National Magazine of the Drug Trade," Drug Topics, 36: 3 (March, 1920), p. 3.

Martin, Eric W. "Editorials," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 18: 1 (January, 1957), p. 26.

Mayes, Herbert B. "At Last the N.A.R.D. Membership Receives All the Facts," American Druggist, 87: 6 (June, 1933), p. 35.

Mayes, Herbert R. "Dress UP...Not Down," American Druggist, 85: 2 (February, 1932), p. 19.

Mayo, Caswell A.(?). "The 'American Druggist' As a Monthly," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 59: 7 (October, 1911), p. 30.

Mayo, Caswell A.(?). "Announcement," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 22: 10 (April 21, 1893), pp. 189-190.

Mayo, Caswell A.(?). "A Statement," American Druggist, 22: 1 (July, 1892), p. 1.

"Members Elect Linwood F. Tice President of APhA for 1966-67," The APhA Newsletter, 4: 15 (July 17, 1965), p. 1.

Meyer, Minnie M. "The Pharmaceutical Journals of the United States," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 5 (May, 1933), pp. 424-429.

Neville, Charles. "Even Medicoes Gag at Their Pill English," Saturday Home Magazine, August 1, 1942.

"A Notable Session of the National Executive Committee," The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists, 17: 13 (January 1, 1914), pp. 788-791.

"On Jan. 7, 1952...," American Druggist, 124: 6 (December, 1951), p. 1.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Another Angle of the Education Problem," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 11 (November, 1922), p. 27.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "A.Ph.A.," American Druggist, 72: 9 (September, 1924), p. 30.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The A.Ph.A. Meeting," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 10 (October, 1921), p. 33.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The Apprentice Question," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 3 (March, 1922), pp. 30-31.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "College Courses in Commercial Pharmacy," American Druggist, 71: 11 (November, 1923), p. 32.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Commercial: Professional," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 3 (March, 1922), p. 30.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "A Community Asset," American Druggist, 72: 7 (September, 1924), p. 38.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Demand Discontinuance of 'Drug' in Referring to Narcotic Evil," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 3 (March, 1922), p. 31.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Disagreement in Amity," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 68: 5 (May, 1920), p. 53.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The Druggist's Relation to the Community," American Druggist, 72: 6 (June, 1924), p. 30.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Drug Stores Not Well Represented in Organizations," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 3 (March, 1922), pp. 31-32.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Drug Trade Exposition," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 9 (September, 1922), pp. 37-38.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Education for the Hospital Pharmacist," American Druggist, 71: 8 (August, 1923), pp. 38-39.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Eighty-nine Hundred Pharmacy College Students," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 12 (December, 1922),p. 28.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Festina Lente," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 4 (April, 1921), pp. 49-50.

Parsons, Charles W.)?). "The Headquarters Campaign," American Druggist, 72: 11 (November, 1924), p. 30.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The Hospital Pharmacist," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 7 (July, 1921), p. 32.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Hospital Pharmacists in the A.Ph.A.," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 9 (September, 1921), p. 33.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Hospital Pharmacists in the A.Ph.A.," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 10 (October, 1921), p. 34.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "'I Object' Says Mr. Ford," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 68: 11 (November, 1920), pp. 36-37.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Is Pharmacy Sick?," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 12 (December, 1921), p. 24.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Many Men of Many Minds," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 2 (February, 1922), p. 24.

Parsons,Charles W.(?). "More Discussion Is Invited," American Druggist, 71: 5 (May, 1923), p. 29.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "N.A.R.D. Fears 'Kansas Plan'," American Druggist, 71: 11 (November, 1923), p. 32.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Organization the Remedy," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 3 (March, 1922), p. 32.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The 'Plan' Grows in Strength," American Druggist, 71: 12 (December, 1923), p. 45.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The Professional Education of the Pharmacist," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 68: 1 (January, 1920), pp. 51-52.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "Selecting Pharmacy Students," American Druggist, 71: 3 (March, 1923), pp. 42, 43.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "The Service and Power of the Local Association," American Druggist, 72: 5 (May, 1924), p. 42.

Parsons, Charles W.(?). "There's a Reason," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 70: 6 (June, 1922), p. 24.

Pierson, Romaine(?). "Organization Going Strong," The Practical Druggist, 39: 9 (July, 1921), p. 16.

Pierson, Romaine(?). "The Service of the American Pharmaceutical Association," The Practical Druggist, 39: 9 (September, 1921), p. 14.

Pierson, Romaine(?). "Your State Meeting," The Practical Druggist, 38: 6 (June, 1920), pp. 17-18.

Prescott, Albert B. "Pharmaceutical Education," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 19 (1871), pp. 425-429.

Procter, William, Jr. "Maine Pharmaceutical Association," American Journal of Pharmacy, 40: 1 (January, 1868), pp. 88-89.

"Remarks of S. N. Jones from the N.A.R.D.," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 47 (1899), p. 14.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk," American Druggist, 135: 1 (January 14, 1957), p. 6.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: A Charter for Pharmacy's Supreme Court," American Druggist, 150: 3 (August 3, 1964), pp. 5-8.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Defeatist Talk Vs. the Facts (16)," American Druggist, 148: 4 (August 19, 1963), pp. 13-14.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Defeatist Talk Vs the Facts (18)," American Druggist, 148: 6 (September 16, 1963), pp. 13-14.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Enter the Machine Age," American Druggist, 143: 12 (June 12, 1961), p. 10.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk; Guardians of the Rank & File (3)," American Druggist, 148: 12 (December 9, 1963), p. 10.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Guardians of the Rank & File (4)," American Druggist, 148: 13 (December 23, 1963), p. 10.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Most Serious Threat of All," American Druggist," 142: 1 (July 11, 1960), pp. 9-10.

Rennick, Dan, "Straight Talk: Needed: A Definition of 'Complete Rx Service'," American Druggist, 146: 11 (November 26, 1962), pp. 11-12.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Needed: A Supreme Court for Pharmacy," American Druggist, 149: 13 (June 22, 1964), p. 9.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: Pharmacy's Number One Problem," American Druggist, 143: 7 (April 3, 1961), p. 9.

Rennick, Dan. "Straight Talk: This Case Proves the Need for Verbal Cautions," American Druggist, 149: 12 (June 4, 1964), p. 9.

"Resolution Creating a House of Delegates and Defining its Functions and Duties," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 9 (September, 1912), pp. 928-929.

Rodman, Robert W. "The Columbus Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 7 (July, 1943),pp. 204-205.

Rodman, Robert W. "Hospital Pharmacists Organize," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 3 (March, 1943), pp. 64-65.

Rodman, Robert W. "On the Beam," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 2: 1 (January, 1941), pp. 2-3.

Rodman, Robert W. "To Denver in August," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 2: 6 (June, 1942), pp. 194-195.

Rodman, Robert W. "War Problems Highlight Denver Meeting," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 2: 7 (July, 1942), pp. 224-225.

Rubin, Irving. "The Curriculum Should Help the RxMan Earn a Living Via Professional Service," American Professional Service," American Professional Pharmacist, 29: 6 (June, 1963), pp. 22-23.

Rubin, Irving. "'Detailing' Should Be a 'Must' Course in the College Curriculum," American Professional Pharmacist, 28: 4 (April, 1962),p. 23.

Rubin, Irving(?). "Pharmagrams," American Professional Pharmacist, 27: 1 (January, 1961), pp. 1-2.

Rubin, Irving. "What Is the Public's Image of Pharmacy?," American Professional Pharmacist, 27: 4 (April, 1961), p. 21.

Rubin, Irving. "You Can Boost Pharmacy's Prestige Simply by Mailing Me a Postcard," American Professional Pharmacist, 27: 1 (January, 1961), pp. 17, 19.

Rudd, Wortley F. "Periods in the Growth of National Associations," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 9 (September, 1920), pp. 856-857.

Rusby, Henry H. "President's Address," Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 58 (1910), pp. 434-444.

Ruth, Robert J. "The History of National Pharmacy Week," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 20: 7 (July, 1931), pp. 696-706.

Salisbury, J. H. "The Subordination of Medical Journals to Proprietary Interests," Bulletin of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 1: 7 (July, 1906), pp. 205-207.

Salthe, Ole. "Why Doesn't the Druggist Tell the Consumer?," American Druggist, 102: 5 (November, 1940), p. 152.

Sayre, L. E. "The Spirit of the American Pharmaceutical Association," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 9: 9 (September, 1920), pp. 855-856.

"Secretary's Report," N.A.R.D. Journal, 26: 25 (September 26, 1918), pp. 1264-1266.

"Second Annual A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D. Conference," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 6: 1 (January, 1945), pp. 13-19.

Shanas, Ethel. "The American Journal of Sociology Through Fifty Years," American Journal of Sociology, 50 (1945), pp. 522-533.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "A.I.H.P. Deserves Support," N.A.R.D. Journal, 73: 9 (May 7, 1951), p. 642.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "Blatman Undertakes To Enlighten Dean Tice," N.A.R.D. Journal, 84: 5 (March 5, 1962), pp. 20, 53.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "Brennan Praises Lobraice on 'Federation'," N.A.R.D. Journal, 85: 13 (July 1, 1963), pp. 13, 30.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "Editorial Comments," N.A.R.D. Journal, 75: 1 (January 5, 1953), p. 150.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "Editorial Comments," N.A.R.D. Journal, 75: 5 (March 2, 1953), p. 370.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "N.A.R.D. Editor 'Teaches' Hawkins of I.Ph.A.," N.A.R.D. Journal, 86: 17 (September 7, 1964), pp. 20-21, 71.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "Prestige and Goodwill," N.A.R.D. Journal, 72: 10 (May 15, 1950), p. 734.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "Professor Derides Community Pharmacists," N.A.R.D. Journal, 86: 16 (August 17, 1964), pp. 16-17.

Sletterdahl, Peter J. "The Search for a Utopia or an Elysium," N.A.R.D. Journal, 86: 5 (March 2, 1964), p. 14.

Smith, Daniel B., et al. "Prospectus," Journal of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 1: 1 (April, 1829), pp. 1-2.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. "Education for What?," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 5: 11 (November, 1944), pp. 284-285.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. "Extending Editorial Service," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 10 (October, 1943), p. 303.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. "The Journal Is Born," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, NS1: 12 (December, 1961), pp. 744-745, 776-777.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 4: 12 (December, 1943), pp. 375-376.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 5: 1 (January, 1944), p. 3.

Sonnedecker, Glenn. "The Way It Looks To Us," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, (Practical Pharmacy Edition), 5: 5 (May, 1944), pp. 128-129.

Speed, J. G. "Do Newspapers Now Give the News?," The Forum, 15 (1893), pp. 705-711.

Swain, Robert L. "APhA Convention," Drug Topics, 95: 16 (July 30, 1951), p. 38.

Swain, Robert L. "Boards' Implied Powers," Drug Topics, 97: 8 (April 20, 1953), p. 58.

Swain, Robert L. "Don't Budge!," Drug Topics, 86: 12 (March 23, 1942), p. 18.

Swain, Robert L. "5 Year Study Favored," Drug Topics, 97: 18 (September 7, 1953), p. 68.

Swain, Robert L. "5 Year Program Wins," Drug Topics, 98: 8 (April 19, 1954), p. 50.

Swain, Robert L. "For the War Only," Drug Topics, 87: 34 (October 4, 1943), p. 36.

Swain, Robert L. "Great N.A.R.D. Meeting," Drug Topics, 96: 23 (November 5, 1951), p. 50.

Swain, Robert L. "History Making!," Drug Topics, 87: 40 (December 27, 1943), p. 20.

Swain, Robert L. "'It Can Be Done'," Drug Topics, 87: 34 (October 4, 1943), p. 36.

Swain, Robert L. "Kansas Did It!," Drug Topics, 87: 15 (April 12, 1943), p. 30.

Swain, Robert L. "Let's Close Ranks," Drug Topics, 98: 20 (October 4, 1954), p. 66.

Swain, Robert L. "New Jersey Progress," Drug Topics, 94: 7 (March 27, 1950), p. 44.

Swain, Robert L. "New Jersey Sets Up a Label Bureau," Drug Topics, 56: 14 (April 1, 1940), p. 16.

Swain, Robert L.(?). "Orientation Required," Drug Topics, 104: 22 (October 24, 1960), p. 32.

Swain, Robert L. "Plans for Increasing the Membership in the A.Ph.A.," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 22: 11 (November, 1933), p. 1077.

Swain, Robert L. "Substitution Cure," Drug Topics, 98: 5 (March 8, 1954), p. 58.

Swain, Robert L. "They Don't Like It," Drug Topics, 87: 32 (September 6, 1943), p. 38.

Swain, Robert L. "Time for Learnin'," Drug Topics, 98: 7 (April 5, 1954), p. 60.

Swain, Robert L. "Timely Teamwork!," Drug Topics, 88: 23 (November 13, 1944), p. 36.

Swain, Robert L. "We Must Act Now," Drug Topics, 85: 30 (July 28, 1941), p. 20.

Swain, Robert L. "We're For Them!," Drug Topics, 88:3 (February 7, 1944), p. 34.

Swain, Robert L.(?). "We Will Save Paper For the Duration But We'll Publish the Same Drug Topics," Drug Topics, 87: 28 (July 12, 1943), p. 1.

Swain, Robert L. "Your Pharmacy and Mine: Everlastingly First," Drug Topics, 87: 19 (May 10, 1943), p. 9.

Taeuber, Irene B. "Changes in Content and Presentation in Minnesota Weekly Newspapers, 1860-1929," Journalism Quarterly, 9 (1932), pp. 281-289.

Teeters, Wilber J. "High School Graduation as an Entrance Prerequisite to Colleges of Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 10: 10 (October, 1921), pp. 731-732.

Thorner, Isador. "Pharmacy: The Functional Significance of and Institutional Pattern," Social Forces, 20: 3 (March, 1942), pp. 321-328.

Tice, L. F. "Acceleration As a Continued Policy for Pharmaceutical Education," American Journal of Pharmacy, 116: 7 (July, 1944), pp. 253-255.

Tice, L. F. "Again We Fail," American Journal of Pharmacy, 123: 3 (March, 1951), pp. 76-77.

Tice. L. F. "Another Step Forward," American Journal of Pharmacy, 135: 8 (August, 1963), pp. 276-277.

Tice, L. F. "A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D. Controversy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 122: 11 (November, 1950), pp. 406-407.

Tice. L. F. "'By Their Deeds Shall Ye Know Them'," American Journal of Pharmacy, 114: 7 (July, 1942), pp. 239-240.

Tice, L. F.(?). "Dr. Ivor Griffith," American Journal of Pharmacy, 113: 4 (April, 1941), pp. 130, 141.

Tice. L. F. "An Example for Others," American Journal of Pharmacy, 132: 7 (July, 1960), pp. 250-251.

Tice, L. F. "New Publication Policy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 135: 12 (December, 1963), pp. 432-433.

Tice, L. F. "Now Is the Hour," American Journal of Pharmacy, 133: 10 (October, 1961), pp. 348-350.

Tice. L. F. "Opportunities in Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 135: 11 (November, 1963), pp. 392-394.

Tice. L. F. "Our Policy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 113: 4 (April, 1941), pp 131-132.

Tice, L. F. "The Pharmaceutical Curriculum," American Journal of Pharmacy, 125: 7 (July, 1953), pp. 220-221.

Tice, L. F. "Professional Contact or Self-Service?," American Journal of Pharmacy, 122: 4 (April, 1950), pp. 124-125.

Tice, L. F. "Progress for the Profession," American Journal of Pharmacy, 133: 4 (April, 1961), pp. 124-126.

Tice, L. F. "Rational Practical Experience," American Journal of Pharmacy, 125: 4 (April, 1953), pp. 115-116.

Tice, L. F. "The Sale of Home Remedies," American Journal of Pharmacy, 125: 10 (October, 1953), pp. 322-323.

Tice, L. F. "Substitution--A Threat to Our Profession," American Journal of Pharmacy, 124: 8 (August, 1952), pp. 248-250.

Tice, L. F. "The Trend of Medicinal Agents and Its Effect on Pharmacy," American Journal of Pharmacy, 114: 4 April, 1942), pp. 112-113.

Tice, L. F. "We Must Maintain Our Standards," American Journal of Pharmacy, 114: 3 (March, 1942), pp. 70-71.

Tice, L. F. "Who Is Responsible?," American Journal of Pharmacy, 115: 4 (April, 1943), pp. 120-121.

Urdang, George. "The Precedents of the N.A.R.D. and Its Founding Fifty Years Ago," American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 13: 2 (April, 1949), pp. 358-375.

Viehoever, Arno. "The Home for American Pharmacy," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 13: 5 (May, 1924), pp. 396-397.

"What Druggists Say About the Bernays Survey," American Druggist, 109: 1 (January, 1944), pp. 58, 106, 108.

"What Is the Matter With Pharmacy?," American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record, 69: 12 (December, 1921), pp. 25-31.

Wilcox, Delos F. "The American Newspaper, A Study in Social Psychology," Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, 16 (1900), pp. 56-92.

Youngken, Heber W. "Pharmacognosy and the Pharmacist," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, 12: 1 (January, 1923), pp. 5-6.

Zopf, C. L. "Hospital Pharmacy's Place," American Professional Pharmacist, 3: 4 (April, 1937), pp. 24-25.

Unpublished Materials

Dyer, Reginald E. Letter to Edward Kremers, April 25, 1935. In Kremers Historical Reference Files, The University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

England, J. W. Letter to H. M. Whelpley, August 31, 1910. In Kremers Historical Reference Files, The University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

Holland, Madeline Oxford. "The Development of a Pharmaceutical Journal--the American Professional Pharmacist," Paper presented at the third joint session of the American Institute of the History of Pharmacy and the American Pharmaceutical Association Section on Historical Pharmacy [at the invitation of the A.I.H.P.], Salt Lake City, Utah, August 21, 1953. Typescript in Kremers Historical Reference Files, The University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

Lyman, Rufus A. "The American Institute of the History of Pharmacy and the Pharmaceutical Press." Paper read at the American Institute of the History of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin, 1942. [Mimeographed.]

Mayo, Caswell A. Letter to Edward Kremers, February 27, 1913. In Kremers Historical Reference Files, The University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

Meyer, Minnie M. "The Pharmaceutical Journals of the United States," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1934.

Motter, M. G. Letter to Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association, November 1, 1910. In Kremers Historical Reference Files, The University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

Pierson, Romaine. Letter to Willard G. Bleyer, January 27, 1913. In Kremers Historical Reference Files, The University of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy, Madison, Wisconsin.

APPENDIX A

Content Analysis Coding System

Journal title:

11. American Journal of Pharmacy

22. Practical Druggist and Spatula
23. American Professional Pharmacist

33. Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association
34. Journal ... (Practical Pharmacy Edition)
35. Journal ... (New Series)

44. N.A.R.D. Journal

55. American Druggist and Pharmaceutical Record
56. American Druggist

66. Drug Topics
67. Drug Topics combined with Druggists' Circular

Month:

11. January
12. February
13. March
14. April
15. May
16. June
21. July
22. August
23. September
24. October
25. November
26. December

Year:

20. 1920
21. 1921, etc.

Volume:

001. Vol. 1
010. Vol. 10
100. Vol. 100, etc.

Number:

01. No. 1
10. No. 10, etc.

Editor's Name:

000. No editorial

100. Not ascertained, American Journal of Pharmacy
*101. George M. Beringer
102. Charles H. LaWall
*103. Ivor Griffith
104. Henry Leffmann

---

*Editor or editor-in-chief as indicated on masthead; other names indicate guest editorials.

105. David Wilbur Horn
*106. Linwood F. Tice
107. Fred B. Kilmer
108. Louis Gershenfeld

200. Not ascertained, American Professional Pharmacist
*201. Romaine Pierson
202. F. H. (Frank Healy)
203. G. W. T. (George W. Tuttle)
*204. Reginald E. Dyer
205. W. M. (William Mansfield)
206. E. A. M.
207. O. R. (Otto Raubenheimer)
*208. John N. McDonnell
*209. Madeline Oxford Holland
*210. Irving Rubin

300. Not ascertained, Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association
*301. E. G. Eberle
302. J. W. England
303. Lyman E. Kebler
304. Wilbur L. Scoville
305. L. E. Sayre
306. Wortley F. Rudd
307. Wilbur J. Teeters
308. H. V. Arny
310. Ambrose Hunsberger
311. H. W. Youngken
312. Elmer H. Wirth
313. C. M. Waterburg
314. Frank H. Freericks
315. David Wilbur Horn
316. Frederick J. Wulling
317. Arno Viehoever
318. H. C. Christensen
*319. E. F. Kelly
*320. Robert W. Rodman
*321. Glenn Sonnedecker
*322. Harold V. Darnell
*323. Robert P. Fischelis
*324. Eric W. Martin
325. Robert L. Swain
326. S. Solis Cohen
327. E. N. Gathercoal
328. W. Bruce Phillip
329. E. F. Cooke
330. Adley B. Nichols
331. Anton Hogstead, Jr.
*332. William S. Apple
*333. George B. Griffenhagen

400. Not ascertained, N.A.R.D. Journal
*401. Samuel C. Henry
*402. John W. Dargavel
*403. George A. Bender
*404. Theodore Christianson
*405. Peter J. Sletterdahl

500. Not ascertained, American Druggist
*501. Charles W. Parsons
*502. Caswell A. Mayo
*503. Murray Breese
504. Ray W. Sherman
505. Clarence Lee
506. David W. Haerig
*507. Herbert R. Mayes
508. Arthur Brisbane
509. Howard Stephenson
510. Louis J. F. Moore
511. Albert Grey
512. Ole Salthe
513. Robert R. Gerstner
514. Irving Rubin
*515. Kenneth A. Bonham
*516. Harold W. Hutchins
*517. John W. McPherrin
*518. Dan Rennick

600. Not ascertained, Drug Topics
*601. Jerry McQuade
602. John Goode
603. Dan Rennick
604. Roy Edmunds
*605. Robert L. Swain
*606. Louis E. Kazin

Subject:
000. No editorial
100. ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY
101. Business
102. Marketing
103. Merchandising
104. Advertising, promotions
105. Competition
106. Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fees
107. Hours and wages
108. Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx
109. Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies

200. EDUCATION, PHARMACEUTICAL
201. Standards of
202. Support for; alumni; valedictory
203. Internship; preceptors
204. Continuing

300. GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY
301. Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare
302. Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare
303. Pharmacy, the pharmacist in government
304. In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies, OPA, WPB)
305. Pharmacy Corps; the draft
306. Supporting legislation; pharmacist and politics
307. Communism; Socialism
308. Economy, national (general)
309. Economy, national (specific; depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.)

400. LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY
401. Prohibition
402. Narcotic licenses and control
403. Antitrust and monopoly; FTC
404. Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA
405. Fair Trade; price maintenance and control
406. Other (postal, patent, trademark regulations)
407. Other pharmacy (metric system, proprietaries, public health)
408. Court decisions and definitions
409. State legislation
410. State boards; registration; reciprocity
411. Taxation

500. LITERATURE, PHARMACEUTICAL
501. This journal; reference to article
502. Editor; editorial policy
503. Other journals; literature; publications
504. Official compendia
505. Editorial tributes
506. Personality
507. Anniversary
508. Seasonal

600. ORGANIZATIONS, PHARMACY
601. Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy
602. A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.
603. Other national or state organizations
604. International organizations

700. PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY, THE
701. Interprofessional relations
702. Professional problems
703. "Professionalism"
704. Ethics; codes and oaths
705. Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations
706. Pharmacy in the lay press
707. Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Work," etc.)
708. Other professions
709. Public health
710. Narcotic addiction
711. Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs
712. Postwar problems
713. Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists
714. Professional fraud and quackery; proprietaries and Rx items
715. History of pharmacy
716. Women in pharmacy
717. Hospital pharmacy
718. Pharmaceutical industry
719. Changes in practice

800. RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY
801. Pharmaceutical, therapeutic, chemotherapeutic, new drugs
802. Scientific, technological
803. Economic, manpower, prescription
804. Awards, honors, tributes

900. OTHER
901. Miscellaneous; miscellany
902. Nostalgia; reflections
903. Virtues
904. Bonds, Red Cross, Christmas Seals, Easter Seals, etc.

APPENDIX B

TABLE XXI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Prohibition	8	3	-	-	-	11
Narcotic licenses and control	-	-	-	-	-	-
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	-	-	1	-	-	1
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	-	6	-	1	3	10
Fair Trade; price maintenance and control	-	-	-	-	-	-
State legislation	1	-	-	-	-	1
State Boards; registration; reciprocity	-	-	-	1	-	1
Taxation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Court decisions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	3	-	-	-	1	4
TOTAL	12	9	1	2	4	28

TABLE XXII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34 (Practical Druggist)	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1960-64 (American Professional Pharmacist)	Total
Prohibition	54	10	-	-	-	64
Narcotic licenses and control	5	2	-	-	-	7
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	-	-	1	-	-	1
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	7	8	3	2	1	21
Fair Trade; price maintenance and control	4	11	1	-	-	16
State legislation	3	1	-	-	-	4
State Boards; registration; reciprocity	2	1	-	1	-	4
Taxation	10	7	-	-	-	17
Court Decisions	4	1	1	1	1	8
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	5	1	1	-	-	7
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	3	1	-	-	-	4
TOTAL	97	43	7	4	2	153

TABLE XXIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Prohibition	2	-	-	-	-	2
Narcotic licesnses and control	-	3	-	-	-	3
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	-	-	-	-	-	-
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	-	3	1	12	1	17
Fair Trade; price maintenance and control	-	-	-	2	-	2
State legislation	1	-	-	-	-	1
State Boards; registration; reciprocity	-	-	-	1	-	1
Taxation	-	-	1	-	-	1
Court decisions	-	-	-	3	2	5
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	-	-	1	-	-	1
TOTAL	3	6	3	18	3	33

TABLE XXIV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Prohibition	110	7	1	-	-	118
Narcotic licenses and control	30	7	-	3	-	40
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	2	1	4	4	2	13
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	-	1	4	7	-	12
Fair Trade; price maintenance and control	6	32	15	25	1	79
State legislation	5	-	1	2	-	8
State Boards; registration; reciprocity	2	-	-	1	-	3
Taxation	24	10	4	8	1	47
Court decisions	2	1	1	6	8	18
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	1	-	1	1	1	4
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	10	-	-	1	-	11
TOTAL	192	59	31	58	13	353

TABLE XXV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD (*American Druggist*)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Prohibition	32	-	-	-	-	32
Narcotic licenses and control	1	-	-	-	-	1
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	-	-	-	-	-	-
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	-	-	1	-	3	4
Fair Trade; price maintenance and control	1	1	3	5	3	13
State legislation	3	-	-	-	-	3
State Boards; registration; reciprocity	9	1	-	-	-	10
Taxation	5	-	-	-	-	5
Court decisions	6	-	-	-	9	15
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	3	-	-	-	-	3
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	3	-	-	-	-	3
TOTAL	63	2	4	5	15	89

TABLE XXVI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH LEGISLATION AFFECTING PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Prohibition	7	-	-	-	-	7
Narcotic licenses and control	-	-	5	3	1	9
Antitrust and monopoly; FTC	1	-	1	-	2	4
Durham-Humphrey; FDC-FDA	-	1	5	7	3	16
Fair Trade; price maintenance and control	1	10	8	21	2	42
State legislation	-	2	5	2	1	10
State Boards; registration; reciprocity	-	-	1	4	3	8
Taxation	2	1	5	3	-	11
Court decisions	1	1	-	10	7	19
Other (postal, patent, trademark)	-	2	1	1	-	4
Other pharmacy (proprietaries, public health)	1	-	2	-	-	3
TOTAL	13	17	33	51	19	133

TABLE XXVII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Business	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marketing	-	-	-	1	-	1
Merchandising	-	-	-	-	-	-
Advertising, promotions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Competition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	-	1	-	1	-	2
Hours and wages	-	-	-	-	-	-
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	-	-	1	1	2
TOTAL	-	1	-	3	1	5

TABLE XXVIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34 (Practical Druggist)	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1960-64 (American Professional Pharmacist)	TOTAL
Business	8	8	1	-	-	17
Marketing	-	4	-	-	1	5
Merchandising	11	12	1	-	-	24
Advertising, promotions	11	17	-	1	3	32
Competition	3	11	-	1	-	15
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	2	-	-	4	1	7
Hours and wages	1	-	1	-	-	2
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	4	-	-	-	1	5
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	40	52	3	6	6	107

TABLE XXIX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Business	1	-	-	-	-	1
Marketing	-	-	-	1	-	1
Merchandising	-	1	-	-	-	1
Advertising, promotions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Competition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	-	3	-	-	-	3
Hours and wages	-	-	-	-	-	-
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	-	-	-	-	1	1
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	-	-	-	1	1
TOTAL	1	4	-	1	2	8

TABLE XXX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Business	12	4	12	9	-	37
Marketing	5	4	1	4	-	14
Merchandising	3	2	14	8	-	27
Advertising, promotions	2	-	-	1	-	3
Competition	4	4	6	2	-	16
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	-	-	-	3	1	4
Hours and wages	1	-	2	-	1	4
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	3	14	2	-	4	23
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	-	1	-	-	1
TOTAL	30	28	38	27	6	129

TABLE XXXI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Business	8	1	-	-	-	9
Marketing	6	-	-	-	2	8
Merchandising	20	1	1	2	2	26
Advertising, promotions	2	-	-	-	2	4
Competition	3	3	1	1	5	13
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	-	-	-	1	4	5
Hours and wages	1	1	-	-	-	2
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	-	1	-	-	6	7
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	1	-	-	-	1
TOTAL	40	8	2	4	21	75

TABLE XXXII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Business	-	1	6	8	5	20
Marketing	1	-	3	3	2	9
Merchandising	14	4	8	26	27	79
Advertising, promotions	1	-	2	21	11	35
Competition	1	5	8	5	6	25
Rx pricing; high cost of drugs and care; professional fee	-	-	1	2	1	4
Hours and wages	1	1	3	-	-	5
Price cutting and fixing; mail-order Rx	4	3	-	-	-	7
Manpower; limiting the number of pharmacies	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	22	14	31	65	52	184

TABLE XXXIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Interprofessional relations	-	-	-	-	2	2
Professional problems	-	-	-	2	1	3
"Professionalism"	4	-	2	4	-	10
Ethics; codes and oaths	-	-	-	-	-	-
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	-	-	-	1	-	1
Pharmacy in the lay press	1	-	-	-	-	1
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	-	1	-	-	-	1
Other professions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public health	1	3	4	-	2	10
Narcotic addiction	1	-	-	1	-	2
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	1	3	4
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	1	1	-	1	2	5
History of pharmacy	7	5	-	-	-	12
Women in pharmacy	-	-	1	-	-	1
Hospital pharmacy	1	1	-	-	-	2
Pharmaceutical industry	-	-	-	-	-	-
Changes in practice	-	2	1	-	-	3
TOTAL	16	13	8	10	10	57

TABLE XXXIV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Interprofessional relations	-	1	5	6	3	15
Professional problems	-	-	-	-	1	1
"Professionalism"	1	1	10	5	1	18
Ethics; codes and oaths	-	1	1	2	-	4
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	3	5	1	3	2	14
Pharmacy in the lay press	1	-	-	-	-	1
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	-	9	5	1	-	15
Other professions	-	-	-	1	-	1
Public health	3	3	4	9	4	23
Narcotic addiction	5	1	-	1	-	7
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	1	2	3
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	2	-	-	-	-	2
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	6	1	1	-	-	8
History of pharmacy	-	1	2	2	[illegible]	5
Women in pharmacy	-	-	3	-	-	3
Hospital pharmacy	-	-	1	1	2	4
Pharmaceutical industry	-	-	-	1	-	1
Changes in practice	-	3	2	-	-	5
TOTAL	21	26	35	33	15	130

TABLE XXXV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (*Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association*)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Interprofessional relations	3	3	5	2	-	13
Professional problems	-	-	-	-	-	-
"Professionalism"	3	6	1	2	1	13
Ethics; codes and oaths	-	-	-	1	1	2
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	3	1	1	-	2	7
Pharmacy in the lay press	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	-	5	3	3	2	13
Other professions	-	-	-	1	-	1
Public health	1	3	4	7	5	20
Narcotic addiction	2	3	-	-	-	5
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	-	-	-	-	-	-
History of pharmacy	-	9	-	-	-	9
Women in pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hospital pharmacy	-	2	1	-	-	3
Pharmaceutical industry	-	-	-	-	-	-
Changes in practice	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	12	32	15	16	11	86

TABLE XXXVI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Interprofessional relations	-	1	3	7	2	13
Professional problems	-	-	-	-	1	1
"Professionalism"	-	3	3	3	1	10
Ethics; codes and oaths	1	-	-	-	-	1
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	1	-	1	6	1	9
Pharmacy in the lay press	1	2	3	2	-	8
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	8	18	7	-	-	33
Other professions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public health	-	-	3	2	-	5
Narcotic addiction	5	-	-	1	-	6
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	2	6	-	2	-	10
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	-	-	-	5	1	6
History of pharmacy	-	1	-	3	2	6
Women in pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hospital pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmaceutical industry	-	1	-	6	4	11
Changes in practice	-	-	3	-	-	3
TOTAL	18	32	23	37	12	122

TABLE XXXVII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (*American Druggist*)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Interprofessional relations	2	-	-	-	-	2
Professional problems	1	-	-	-	-	1
"Professionalism"	8	1	1	1	2	13
Ethics; codes and oaths	-	-	-	-	-	-
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	3	-	4	-	2	9
Pharmacy in the lay press	1	-	-	-	-	1
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	-	5	-	-	-	5
Other professions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public health	1	-	-	-	1	2
Narcotic addiction	2	-	-	-	-	2
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	-	3	3
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	2	-	-	-	-	2
History of pharmacy	-	1	-	-	-	1
Women in pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hospital pharmacy	1	-	-	-	-	1
Pharmaceutical industry	-	-	-	-	-	-
Changes in practice	-	1	-	-	4	5
TOTAL	21	8	5	1	12	47

TABLE XXXVIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Interprofessional relations	-	-	-	1	1	2
Professional relations	-	-	-	-	-	-
"Professionalism"	-	-	-	4	2	6
Ethics; codes and oaths	-	-	-	2	2	4
Image of pharmacy and the pharmacist; public relations	-	-	-	-	2	2
Pharmacy in the lay press	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional promotions ("Pharmacy Week," etc.)	-	2	3	2	-	7
Other professions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public health	2	-	7	5	3	17
Narcotic addiction	-	-	-	2	-	2
Generic drugs; drug classification; foreign drugs	-	-	-	-	1	1
Crimes, frauds perpetrated on pharmacists	1	-	-	1	-	2
Professional fraud and quackery; proprietary and Rx items	2	-	-	1	-	3
History of pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Women in pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hospital pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmaceutical industry	-	1	-	2	2	5
Changes in practice	-	-	6	2	1	9
TOTAL	5	3	16	22	14	60

TABLE XXXIX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD (*American Journal of Pharmacy*)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy	-	-	-	2	3	5
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	2	-	-	-	1	3
Other National or state organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-
International organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2	-	-	2	4	8

TABLE XL

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD (*American Professional Pharmacist*)	1920-24	1930-34 (*Practical Druggist*)	1940-44	1950-54 (*American Professional Pharmacist*)	1960-64	TOTAL
Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy	1	2	1	5	2	11
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	6	3	3	2	-	14
Other National or state organizations	7	3	1	2	-	13
International organizations	-	-	1	2	1	4
TOTAL	14	8	6	11	3	42

TABLE XLI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy	-	1	-	1	2	4
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	20	11	8	20	6	65
Other National or state organizations	1	2	-	4	-	7
International organizations	-	2	-	3	-	5
TOTAL	21	16	8	28	8	81

TABLE XLII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy	1	8	2	-	3	14
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	63	39	7	6	5	120
Other National or state organizations	17	4	3	1	-	25
International organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	81	51	12	7	8	159

TABLE XLIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy	4	1	2	-	4	11
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	11	1	1	-	-	13
Other National or state organizations	10	-	-	-	-	10
International organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	25	2	3	-	4	34

TABLE XLIV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACY ORGANIZATIONS BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Support your; affiliation, one voice for pharmacy	-	1	1	1	2	5
A.Ph.A.-N.A.R.D.	-	4	5	4	3	16
Other National or state organizations	-	-	4	1	3	8
International organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	5	10	6	8	29

TABLE XLV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	-	1	2	-	1	4
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	-	2	1	1	-	4
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	-	-	-	-
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	3	1	-	4
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	-	-	-	1	-	1
Communism; Socialism	-	-	-	1	-	1
National economy (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.	-	1	-	-	-	1
TOTAL	-	4	6	4	1	15

TABLE XLVI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	1	-	2	2	3	8
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	-	-	5	5	1	11
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	-	-	-	-
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	18	1	-	19
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	1	6	-	-	7
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	1	-	-	1	-	2
Communism; Socialism	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.)	4	6	1	1	-	12
TOTAL	6	7	32	10	4	59

TABLE XLVII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	-	-	-	1	-	1
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	-	1	-	1	1	3
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	7	-	2	-	9
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	7	2	1	10
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	-	4	-	-	4
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	1	-	-	-	2	3
Communism; Socialism	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.)	1	4	-	-	-	5
TOTAL	2	12	11	6	4	35

TABLE XLVIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	4	1	1	-	12	18
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	2	-	2	2	5	11
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	-	-	-	-
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	7	-	-	7
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	1	4	-	-	5
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	4	2	1	5	2	14
Communism; Socialism	-	-	1	2	-	3
National economy (general)	1	-	-	1	1	3
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.)	-	31	3	-	-	34
TOTAL	11	35	19	10	20	95

TABLE XLIX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	1	-	1	1	2	5
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	-	-	-	-	2	2
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	-	-	-	-
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	3	-	-	3
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	-	1	-	-	1
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	1	-	1	-	-	2
Communism; Socialism	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.)	1	1	3	-	4	9
TOTAL	3	1	9	1	8	22

TABLE L

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Intervention in, investigation of pharmacy; VA; welfare	-	-	3	2	5	10
Socialized medicine; prepaid Rx insurance; Medicare	-	-	-	6	-	6
Pharmacy and the pharmacist in government	-	-	-	-	-	-
In wartime (civil defense, drug supplies; OPA; WPB)	-	-	21	5	1	27
Pharmacy Corps; the draft	-	-	7	-	-	7
Supporting legislation; the pharmacist in politics	-	-	1	1	1	3
Communism; Socialism	-	-	-	-	-	-
National economy (general)	-	-	-	1	-	1
National economy (specific: depression, drug codes, NRA, inflation, unemployment, etc.)	-	17	-	6	-	23
TOTAL	-	17	32	21	7	77

TABLE LI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
This journal; reference to article	-	-	-	-	-	-
Editor; editorial policy	-	-	2	-	-	2
Other journals; literature, publications	-	-	-	-	-	-
Official compendia	2	-	4	2	-	8
Editorial tributes	1	1	-	-	1	3
Pharmacy personalities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal	1	1	-	-	-	2
TOTAL	4	2	6	2	1	15

TABLE LII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
This journal; reference to article	5	8	8	-	2	23
Editor; editorial policy	-	-	-	-	1	1
Other journals; literature, publications	-	1	1	2	-	4
Official compendia	1	1	1	1	-	4
Editorial tributes	-	1	1	1	1	4
Pharmacy personalities	2	1	-	-	-	3
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal	2	4	1	-	-	7
TOTAL	10	16	12	4	4	46

TABLE LIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
This journal; reference to article	-	-	2	-	1	3
Editor; editorial policy	-	-	1	-	-	1
Other journals; literature, publications	1	-	-	3	-	4
Official compendia	6	11	3	5	1	26
Editorial tributes	3	1	-	3	-	7
Pharmacy personalities	-	-	-	1	-	1
Anniversaries	-	-	1	1	-	2
Seasonal	1	3	-	-	-	4
TOTAL	11	15	7	13	2	48

TABLE LIV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
This journal; reference to article	4	6	2	-	-	12
Editor; editorial policy	-	2	-	-	-	2
Other journals; literature, publications	-	-	-	-	-	-
Official compendia	1	2	1	1	-	5
Editorial tributes	2	1	-	6	2	11
Pharmacy personalities	5	-	2	2	-	9
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal	7	2	2	1	1	13
TOTAL	19	13	7	10	3	52

TABLE LV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
This journal; reference to article	25	1	1	1	-	28
Editor; editorial policy	1	-	1	-	-	2
Other journals; literature, publications	2	1	-	-	-	3
Official compendia	5	-	-	-	-	5
Editorial tributes	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmacy personalities	2	2	-	-	-	4
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal	2	2	1	-	3	8
TOTAL	37	6	3	1	3	50

TABLE LVI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL LITERATURE BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
This journal; reference to article	-	-	-	-	-	-
Editor; editorial policy	-	1	-	-	-	1
Other journals; literature, publications	-	-	-	-	4	4
Official compendia	1	1	5	3	-	10
Editorial tributes	-	-	-	2	-	2
Pharmacy personalities	-	1	3	6	2	12
Anniversaries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal	-	-	3	-	-	3
TOTAL	1	3	11	11	6	32

TABLE LVII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	4	-	3	2	1	10
Scientific, technological (non-pharmacuetical)	5	4	1	-	-	10
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	1	-	-	-	1
Awards, honors, prizes	1	-	-	-	2	3
TOTAL	10	5	4	2	3	24

TABLE LVIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	5	8	5	4	2	24
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	5	4	1	1	-	11
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	7	1	7	-	15
Awards, honors, prizes	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	10	19	7	12	2	50

TABLE LIX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	11	2	1	1	-	15
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	-	-	-	1	-	1
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	2	-	-	-	2
Awards, honors, prizes	1	-	-	2	1	4
TOTAL	12	4	1	4	1	22

TABLE LX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	-	-	1	2	-	3
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	3	1	-	1	5
Awards, honors, prizes	1	-	-	3	-	4
TOTAL	1	3	2	5	1	12

TABLE LXI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	1	-	-	-	-	1
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	3	-	-	-	-	3
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	-	-	-	4	4
Awards, honors, prizes	2	-	-	-	1	3
TOTAL	6	-	-	-	5	11

TABLE LXII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH RESEARCH, DISCOVERY, AND INVENTION IN PHARMACY BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Pharmaceutical, therapeutic; new drugs	2	-	1	1	-	4
Scientific, technological (non-pharmaceutical)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic, manpower, prescription	-	-	-	1	1	2
Awards, honors, prizes	-	-	-	2	-	2
TOTAL	2	-	1	4	1	8

TABLE LXIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Standards of education	2	1	6	3	2	14
Support for; valedictory	-	-	1	-	-	1
Internship; preceptors	-	-	-	1	-	1
Continuing education	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2	1	7	4	2	16

TABLE LXIV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
	(Practical Druggist)		(American Professional Pharmacist)			
Standards of education	3	3	3	1	1	11
Support for; valedictory	1	-	2	-	-	3
Internship; preceptors	1	-	-	1	-	2
Continuing education	-	2	3	2	2	9
TOTAL	5	5	8	4	3	25

TABLE LXV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Standards of education	12	2	2	11	-	27
Support for; valedictory	1	-	-	1	-	2
Internship; preceptors	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continuing education	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	13	2	2	12	-	29

TABLE LXVI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Standards of education	-	-	3	1	-	4
Support for; valedictory	-	-	1	-	1	2
Internship; preceptors	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continuing education	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	4	1	1	6

TABLE LXVII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Standards of education	17	-	-	-	1	18
Support for; valedictory	-	1	-	-	-	1
Internship; preceptors	1	-	-	-	-	1
Continuing education	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	18	1	-	-	1	20

TABLE LXVIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Standards of education	-	-	5	8	5	18
Support for; valedictory	-	-	1	1	4	6
Internship; preceptors	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continuing education	-	-	-	2	1	3
TOTAL	-	-	6	11	10	27

TABLE LXIX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD (American Journal of Pharmacy)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Miscellaneous; miscellany	2	2	2	-	-	6
Nostalgia, reflections	1	1	-	-	-	2
Virtues	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	-	-	-	-	1	1
TOTAL	3	3	2	-	1	9

TABLE LXX

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD (American Professional Pharmacist)	1920-24 (Practical Druggist)	1930-34 (Practical Druggist)	1940-44 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1950-54 (American Professional Pharmacist)	1960-64 (American Professional Pharmacist)	TOTAL
Miscellaneous; miscellany	2	3	-	1	-	6
Nostalgia, reflections	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virtues	7	4	-	-	-	11
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	2	1	-	10	1	14
TOTAL	11	8	-	11	1	31

TABLE LXXI

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD (Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Miscellaneous; miscellany	1	-	-	-	-	1
Nostalgia, reflections	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virtues	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	1	1	-	2	1	5
TOTAL	2	1	-	2	1	6

TABLE LXXII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD (N.A.R.D. Journal)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Miscellaneous; miscellany	1	1	-	5	-	7
Nostalgia, reflections	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virtues	-	-	1	-	-	1
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	3	2	-	-	-	5
TOTAL	4	3	1	5	-	13

TABLE LXXIII

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD (American Druggist)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Miscellaneous; miscellany	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nostalgia, reflections	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virtues	3	-	-	-	-	3
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	3	-	-	-	-	3
TOTAL	6	-	-	-	-	6

TABLE LXXIV

EDITORIALS DEALING WITH "OTHER" SUBJECTS BY PERIOD (Drug Topics)	1920-24	1930-34	1940-44	1950-54	1960-64	TOTAL
Miscellaneous; miscellany	2	-	-	1	-	3
Nostalgia, reflections	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virtues	3	2	-	1	-	6
Bond drives; Red Cross; Christmas Seals; Easter Seals	-	-	2	-	-	2
TOTAL	5	2	2	2	-	11

APPROVED Ernest W. Stein

Major Professor

Associate Professor of Pharmacy

Title

DATE 19 May 1967