

# THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES OF PHARMACY

C. B. JORDAN—CHAIRMAN OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, A. A. C. P., EDITOR OF THIS  
DEPARTMENT.

*Editorial Note:* The following paper, "Has Freshman English Any Permanent Value?" by Alice-Esther Garvin of the Connecticut College of Pharmacy, should be read with thought and care by every teacher in colleges of pharmacy. Miss Garvin has set forth, most emphatically, the need for more and better training in English in colleges of pharmacy if the pharmacist is to take his place as an educated man in his community. I am very sure that no one can take any exceptions to her well-rounded argument on this point. If only one year of English is to be given in the college of pharmacy, there will be differences of opinion as to whether this should be given in the freshman or senior years. English is a tool that the student *must* use throughout his college course and therefore our better colleges, liberal arts, scientific, professional and technical, place it in the first year. Miss Garvin presents splendid arguments for placing it in the senior year. Whether her arguments offset the traditional one presented above is the question that the reader must settle for himself.—C. B. JORDAN, *Editor*.

## HAS FRESHMAN ENGLISH ANY PERMANENT VALUE?

BY ALICE-ESTHER GARVIN.\*

We learn from experience that we learn nothing from experience. Some time ago, with a more or less sanguine hope that pharmacists with college training might be looked upon as the social, intellectual, and professional equals of physicians, surgeons, attorneys, *et al.*, cultural subjects were included in the pharmacy college curriculum. Among these scientifically extraneous subjects was the language supposedly current in the United States: *i. e.*, English. Of course the question naturally arose as to the year in which this study might most logically be placed, and, alas for its permanent value, it was thrust into the first year with the introductory courses in other subjects.

Few people engaged in the heart-rending task of "raising the standard of pharmacy" can deny that English is one of the most important studies taught at any college. Surely a man is judged by his ability to express himself well, to write accurately and forcefully, and to discuss, with his colleagues, affairs of national and international importance. From the point of view of the customer, the pharmacist who speaks well inspires more confidence than the one who seems to have no sense of grammar, who habitually mispronounces or incorrectly uses his words, or whose entire vocabulary seems to be "What else?" or "Will that be all?" We are rapidly approaching the point where people do not expect the druggist to know anything except the compounding of prescriptions, the methods of selling cosmetics, and the relative values of certain patent medicines. If a pharmacist *does* happen to read something besides *True Detective Mysteries*, *War Stories*, *True Confessions*, or *Ballyhoo*, he is looked upon as being so far superior to his fellow-druggists that an explanation is demanded. Contrary to the general belief, intelligent customers like to chat with a pharmacist, particularly if he is the proprietor of a neighborhood store. If he wishes to retain their patronage and goodwill, he must be able to discuss, in fairly well-chosen words, the topics in which

---

\* Lecturer in English, Connecticut College of Pharmacy.