

Editor's Introduction:

Envisioning the Future

by Lucas Richert

HISTORIANS WILL BE analyzing 2020 for many years to come. COVID-19. Black Lives Matter. The Trump administration. Impeachment. And so much more.

Here in Madison, the American Institute of the History of Pharmacy's Board of Directors recently affirmed support for the "Stand Against Racial Injustice," announced by thirteen national pharmacy organizations in a joint statement on June 5, 2020.¹ At the journal, when we think critically about the needless death of George Floyd, the removal of confederate statues and symbols, and massive protests in support of racial justice across the country, it's worth highlighting that the field of pharmacy history has plenty more to do when it comes to better telling the stories of people of color. And AIHP, itself, has an important role to play in improving its ability to collect, preserve, and provide access to historical sources and collections by and about African Americans and other historically marginalized groups.

The recent constellation of national and international events has forced everyone at AIHP to think about these vital issues and to consider: what's next, where and how can we improve, what will the Institute's next eighty years look like? Put differently, we are still actively involved in envisioning our future!

In Fall 2019, *Pharmacy in History* published its special issue called *The Future*. To celebrate the journal's sixty-year run, it seemed fitting to evaluate the field, generate a big-picture conversation, and think about the past, present, and the years ahead. As a means of carrying on the exchange of ideas, the following pages hold two responses to our *Future* issue. One comes from Professor Elizabeth Siegel Watkins, author of the 2009 article, "From History of Pharmacy to Pharmaceutical History," which served as the inspiration behind the *Future* issue. Over a decade later, she argues that we ought not "silo our way into obscurity." Instead, Watkins notes: "let's build that big tent and invite a wide range of participants to reveal—for a wide range of audiences—the ways in which pharmacy intersects with so many other aspects of the human experience." I heartily agree. Also offering a response to the *Future* issue is Professor Doctor Alex Helmstaedter, the President of the International Society of the History of Pharmacy, who points out that "pharmaceutical history is a historical but also a pharmaceutical discipline." He advocates for the integration of history in pharmacy education and encourages more inter-disciplinary collaborations between historians and pharmacists. He also rightly offers constructive criticism of the issue and ideas about potential research areas.

Besides these thoughtful responses, this issue contains two major research articles. First, Professor Jacalyn Duffin, investigates paclitaxel, in a much-needed addition to the underdeveloped historiography about the Canadian pharmaceutical industry. One of the keynote speakers at last year's International Congress for the History of Pharmacy, Duffin is a Canadian hematologist and historian. From 1988 until 2017, she held the Hannah Chair in the History of Medicine at Queen's University. Part medical and business history, with a dose of activism thrown in, Duffin's paper offers a "new angle on the romantic tale of anti-cancer drugs derived

1. "National Pharmacy Organizations Unite to Take a Stand Against Racial Injustice," National Pharmaceutical Association, June 5, 2020, https://nationalpharmaceuticalassociation.org/resources/Documents/Pharmacists_RacialInjustice_V2.pdf.

from the mysterious yew tree.” Second, Dr. Patricia Barton’s article investigates a much earlier period and marks an important intervention in the history of British intoxicants and medical professionalization in the early twentieth century. Blending cultural, medical, and politico-legal analysis, Barton skillfully locates the British retail chemist—the equivalent of an American community pharmacist—firmly in the narrative of drug regulation. In the years ahead, I look forward to seeing more work like this in other contexts.

I am also delighted to introduce “Conversations,” a new regular section of our journal. “Conversations” will feature interviews and discussions with researchers about their experiences studying and writing about the history of pharmacy, pharmaceuticals, drugs, and medicines. We hope that these more informal exchanges of ideas will benefit novice and experienced scholars, alike, as our interview subjects discuss topics like the history of the field, research techniques and strategies, and the current state of the discipline. Our inaugural interview features Professor Nancy Campbell, a pioneer in the field of social studies of science and technology, who has long investigated the subjects of drugs and addiction. Settle in for a deep and stimulating interview.

A series of illuminating reviews of recent books and multimedia sources forms the largest review section in the history of the journal. And Greg Higby’s “Visual Pharmacy” section closes the issue, reminding us that vendors of quack therapies and medicines of questionable efficacy have long taken advantage of pandemic diseases to peddle their wares to nervous and frightened customers.

Finally, it’s also important to note that the journal continues to evolve. Dr. Ian Miller, formerly a book review editor, has left us for a similar position at the *Social History of Medicine*. Of course, we wish him well. And we are thrilled to warmly welcome David Courtwright (University of North Florida), Paula De Vos (San Diego State), and Ben Urick (University of North Carolina) to the editorial board.

I hope you enjoy *PH* volume 62, numbers 1 & 2.