Introductory Address ON LUCIDITY.

DELIVERED AT

ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL SCHOOL

BY

H. A. MIERS, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

SOME of the most difficult problems in education are those connected with professional training, and as time goes on these do not tend, I fear, to become more easy.

The requirements of the professions become every year more exacting; if the student is to get to work on the business of life before his grey hairs appear, he is driven to begin his professional training earlier, and to compress more and more into the few years at his disposal. And so it becomes increasingly difficult to secure in addition that general education which every one knows to be so desirable, that introduction to the world of literature, science, and art, which ought to be more useful, perhaps, to the medical man than to the member of almost any profession.

I confess that up to the present time medical men have held their own in a marvellous manner as students and exponents of all that makes up general culture, and that, judged at any rate by the standard of their leading men, they have managed to keep their wider interests and activities flourishing and fruitful, in spite of the exacting calls of a strenuous profession, and the years of very special study by which it has to be preceded.

If I may quote only one example of local significance, the annual exhibition of paintings by the St. George's Hospital staff used to give abundant evidence that even within the walls of a single hospital quite a number of accomplished physicians and surgeons may prove themselves to be equally accomplished as artists.

But whether this is to continue, whether the increasing pressure of professional training, and the overcrowded nature of the school curriculum which comes before it, are not going to rob the medical man of some of his literary and artistic interests and powers, I should not venture to predict. The serious business of fighting disease, and the necessity of mastering all the weapons with which the never-ceasing contest is to be waged, are making the medical man's life one of such grim earnest, that he will perhaps have in the future even less opportunities than he has now for those more refined studies and pursuits that presuppose some leisure and freedom of mind.

I wish, however, on the present occasion to draw attention to one feature of modern school and university life that represents a more serious defect, or at any rate the danger of a defect, in the medical profession, and not only in this, but in the other professions; may be, not only in professions, but in all walks of life.

It is, perhaps, not a matter of serious importance to the world at large whether a medical man can give expression to his ideas with the brush or pencil, provided that he be sufficiently learned and accomplished in the exercise of his calling. He is not necessarily a better doctor because he possesses and can exercise this artistic gift; neither is it necessary that he should have the powers of expression of an author or a musician. But there is need of one power that is as important to him, as to others, and that is the ability to express his meaning in the written words of his own language, the great power resulting from mastery over the pen.

I am led to choose this as a subject on which to address you, not merely from the want of anything new to say, but because it has been borne in upon me as a serious matter by the reports of some of our examiners in the University of London. They say that in medical examinations, and even in the M.D. examination, an essay or thesis is often not only devoid of any literary quality or finish, but is badly constructed and difficult to understand.

If this can be so at the end of a man's university career, what must it have been at the beginning, and is there any chance of its becoming any better as he grows older?

I do not think that the fault is entirely that of the

candidates themselves. Whatever subjects they may have learnt at preparatory or public schools, the writing of their own language has in general not been one of them; even during their university career the use of the written English language, except as a machine for the taking of notes, or the answering of examination questions, or the bare record of work done, has not formed any regular part of their course.

The proper teaching of English at school is a large and important subject and one on which I do not propose to enter at present; the acquisition of a good literary style is a luxury to which all cannot aspire; to which, indeed, comparatively few can attain; but the power of expressing clearly one's own ideas in one's own language is a thing which ought now to be within reach of every English-speaking man and woman. That so many of us do not possess it, even those who are quite well educated and accomplished persons, is due, I think, not so much to the fact that we have not been properly taught as to the fact that we have not been encouraged to teach ourselves.

To me it has always seemed remarkable that while there are few who fail to express their meaning intelligibly by the spoken word, there are so many who fail to be intelligible when they write. The two faculties seem quite disconnected, and there is apparently nothing which necessarily makes the same person a good speaker and a good writer. Among those who are inarticulate in speech, and little able to convey their meaning in simple straightforward sentences, are to be found some both thoughtful and learned persons to whom writing seems the only proper and easy medium of expression. And on the other hand, every one must be familiar with examples of clever and accomplished speakers who lose all their power of expression when they write. And, more strange still, mastery over another language and ease of diction in a foreign tongue may exist side by side with the inability to write or to speak clearly in the mother tongue. I have known Englishmen who could be trusted to write a more intelligible treatise, possibly even to make a more lucid speech, in Latin than in English. Quite seriously I think some part of the cause is to be sought in the difficulty of our language, and many educated persons get lost in its intricacies just as they get lost in its spelling. One must, of course, realize that the same wealth of vocabulary and variety of construction which make the language difficult, bestow upon it the greatest possibilities in the matter of style. But for this very reason I do not believe that the remedy for the defect of which complaint is made is to be found in the imitation of great authors.

It is often assumed that constant reading and imitation of the great masters of English literature will enable one to acquire a style which is good because it is based upon theirs. John Bright and Professor Tyndall, to mention only two among many, attributed much of their own command of language to the fact that they had early in life been made intimately familiar with the English Bible and with the works of Milton, and that they had maintained their knowledge of these masterpieces of style through life.

But I think it will be found that they had both already, by another process to which I will presently direct your attention, acquired the power of expressing themselves in straightforward English, the one in speaking, the other in writing, at an early stage of their career; and it is to such persons, already so equipped, that the profound and unceasing study of the great authors brings an increasing mastery over the difficulties of the English language.

To introduce a child to the great masters of style with the injunction that he is to learn to copy them, and by so doing to acquire something of their power, is like expecting an artist to acquire the power of expressing himself by nothing but a course of copying in the picture galleries without independent effort. Listening to good music will not make a musician.

Although the systematic study of great authors is usefully pursued at schools, yet the usual methods of teaching English still leave the average boy and girl singularly deficient in the art of saying what they mean on paper; now, people like ourselves who have more or less finished our education are not going to get very much more out of it than children, who in these matters are far more ready and apt pupils than ourselves, being, of course, more imitative and quicker to learn.

Except to those who have already acquired in some measure the faculty of expressing themselves *in their own way*, indifferent though that may be, I do not think that the mere study of authors who possess a great style is going to confer upon the ordinary reader any great power to express himself in the manner of those authors.

I am inclined to believe that the attempt to write good English is to many a person an effort that only makes him sink the deeper into the quicksands of unintelligibility.

For think what this effort means. Analyse the style of Ruskin or Stevenson, of Macaulay or Burke, of Pater or De Quincey; how is a reader who has not yet learnt to make himself intelligible to improve matters by imitating the delicate shades of expression, the fine suggestions, the haunting echoes, the persuasive rhythm of their sentences? Any one of us may admire the consummate skill of such authors just as we may admire the workmanship and the art of a painter without being able to paint a stroke ourselves; or still more easily, perhaps, the beautiful creations of a musician although we cannot write a note of music. Before even the young artist who possesses some natural gift can emulate these he must go through a long apprenticeship. And our great authors are artists in words whom it may not even be desirable for us to emulate. For the difference is that, whereas we cannot all be painters and musicians, but must content ourselves with remaining intelligent admirers and critics, we have perforce all to be writers whether we wish it or no, and our writing will be necessarily either good or bad or indifferent.

What, then, is the necessary foundation which I have been so long suggesting without naming, which is to be secured as the basis, before the delicate structure of good style can be firmly erected? It is simply this, that we should think about expressing our own meaning in absolutely clear and intelligible language before we think about the manner in which that language is to be manipulated, or the style in which the meaning is to be conveyed.

To express some thought of one's own in language which cannot be misunderstood, and which makes it quite clear to others is an extremely difficult task; it is one of the things which is least satisfactorily taught at school and at the university; it is one which has been least effectively acquired by most people among all the necessary things that they have to do in life. You have only to read carefully the letters in the newspapers from people who write, both, I presume, because they think they have something to say, and because they think they can write, to be convinced that what I say is no exaggeration. And then think of the thousands of people who do not write to the newspapers—and, in fact, do not write at all if they can help it, because they know that they are not able to do so with any credit to themselves.

One of the best educational exercises possible in the use of the English language is to take one of these letters and analyse it, and show a child, or, for the matter of that, a grown person, how it fails to make its meaning clear—how in some cases the words may have two meanings and in others no meaning at all.

Let me quote a recent example from a daily paper: "It surely should not be possible for an individual to destroy the trade of a town with which he has no connexion other than as the organizer of a society claiming a general right of interference by practically compelling the permanent closing of industries in which there was before his coming no actual dispute or necessity for interference except in virtue of this society's claim." I have purposely chosen a sentence in which there is really nothing wrong except that it is not clear, so that you are obliged to read it at least twice before you can understand what it means.

But this is after all only criticism, and, as I have said, we are condemned to be not only critics but users of words. And so a much better educational exercise is to get your pupil to write something of his own, and to criticize that in the same manner. Only so will he understand the difficulties by practice, and learn to profit by experience. Some of the best learning in the world is done by making mistakes, and in no subject is this method so effective as in the writing of one own's language.

How is the practice of composition actually taught? Set essays are written and corrected, or a subject is prescribed and the pupil's account of it is criticized. But I suspect that the criticisms are more often directed to

the wrong use of words, to faults of grammar, to defects of style, than to the question of prime importance—namely, intelligibility. And yet a split infinitive is really a far less important fault than a failure to express one's meaning.

Translation ought, one would think, to be a good exercise, for here an effort is made to interpret the ideas of a foreign author into one's own language; yet translation fails to a large extent, because after all they are the ideas of another person which the pupil is called on to express. And so the result is that more attention is paid to the style and the manner than to the intelligibility, and a generation grows up that has never been called upon to make its own meaning clear to any one.

This result is particularly to be feared, and it is particularly noticeable in professional training. I can assure you that I have recently had appeals, both from young officers in the army themselves and from others on their behalf, asking how and where they are to learn to write clear and intelligible reports. For reports they have to write in the exercise of their profession, and these, if they are not clear, fail, of course, in the whole object and purpose of a report. Too late have such persons found out that they have never learnt how to express themselves in simple and clear language. Surely this is the very thing that should have been learnt in early school days.

And now we hear the same complaint from the examiners of medical candidates.

The difficulty is particularly acute with those who, like yourselves, have received a scientific education. I have actually heard teachers and examiners in scientific subjects say of a pupil or examinee that he evidently understands what he is trying to say, but is merely unable to express his meaning. And then they have given him full credit for the knowledge and pardoned him the failure to express it. But surely to be inarticulate on paper is as bad as to be inarticulate in speech. And I can never believe that the man whose ideas are clear can be permanently incapacitated from expressing those ideas intelligibly with his pen. If, however, our scientific teachers and examiners do not insist upon the clear expression of scientific statements which ought more than anything to lend themselves to clear exposition, perhaps the fault is to be laid to their charge.

The quality which I believe we have to seek, one which is so little fostered by our present system of teaching English, is, to put it in a single word, *Lucidity*.

Among the great writers those who impress us most, both by what they have to say and by the manner in which they say it, are those who possess this admirable quality of lucidity. As two pre-eminent examples among the modern I may mention Cardinal Newman and Charles Darwin; in very different ways; for in the one it amounts to the highest perfection of style, while in the other it appears to involve rather an absence of style. Newman's limpid passages, with all their grace, possess the very essence of clear and lucid exposition; analyse any one of these passages and it appears to exhibit nothing but the most direct simplicity. If this be art it is the art of a Duse, which is almost indistinguishable from unaffected nature.

He who possesses such lucidity may graft upon it the style of Milton, or Gibbon, or Ruskin, or Burke, and not much will be either gained or lost; of course a beautiful style confers an additional charm upon all writing, and a page of Newman is better reading than a page of Darwin.

I am aware that lucidity is a word which was originally applied to the mind, and only subsequently to literary expression. When the screen was lifted temporarily from the clouded mind, and the sunshine of reason returned, it was said of the patient in the old legal phraseology: "*Non est compos mentis sed gaudet lucidis intervallis*," and the history of the word is instructive, for it is still the lucidity of mind which has to come before there can be lucidity of expression. There cannot be clear writing without clear thinking; and he who learns to write clearly will in the process learn to think clearly.

Now if I have, up to the present, done little more than deplore the absence of this quality, I do not mean to imply that the only remedy lies in a reformation of our methods of teaching English as school, highly desirable as this may be.

I believe that lucidity of expression is one of those things

which can be acquired without teaching and by learning alone; further, that the only learning necessary is constant practice accompanied by intelligent self-criticism.

We are too apt to be satisfied with the words in which we express ourselves without pausing to think whether they are intelligible.

Take something which you have written and show it to any candid and discerning friend for his criticism, and see whether he does not find in it some flaw that is not at first apparent to yourself. He will tell you the same story as the examiners who look over your thesis: that the words do not say what you mean, and that the expression is in some way or other loose and unintelligible. It is very difficult at first to criticize what we have written ourselves—but the faculty is soon acquired. In ordinary life—since it was not made necessary for us at school—we have so little practice in this useful art. The only occasions when most of us have to weigh our words carefully in order that we may be quite sure that they will not be misunderstood are when we have to compose a telegram or to draft a resolution or an amendment at some meeting; and every one knows how difficult this is. Believe me, the same care is really necessary in anything that we write if it is to stand the test of criticism. The most wholesome experience of all is to have written a book, or an article in a journal, and to see your words staring you in the face in print, and to realize too late how inadequate they are, and that they remain in print to condemn the author for all time.

For the rest, the hasty letter is all that most people have in the way of practice, and the telephone is rapidly making this less and less necessary.

I have said elsewhere that the reason why our grandfathers and grandmothers could express themselves so much better than ourselves is, in my opinion, the fact that they had so much more practice in letter writing, and that the letter was so much more important in their day than in ours. With the disappearance of the long, infrequent, carefully written letter, which would often be criticised at its destination by many eager readers, a great field of literary practice has been removed and has had no successor.

If this be true—and it is the reason why I have been led to believe that the present defect is chiefly due to want of practice—then the remedy is simple: constant practice in careful writing.

It is this which makes most people more ready with their tongues than with their pen; they get more constant practice in speaking than in writing, and they are liable to be constantly called upon to explain themselves if their meaning is not clear. If this check were always ready to be applied to all that is written as to all that is spoken half the difficulty would disappear.

It has always seemed to me that one of the chief reasons why practice is so necessary in both speaking and writing is that the thoughts flow at so different a pace from that of speech or the pen. Many inexperienced speakers are constantly being tripped up in their words in the endeavour to keep pace with their own thoughts, trying to retain a hold upon the swift thought while they are following it in less rapid speech. If this be so with speaking, still more must it be true with writing, where the hand and pen lag behind at a yet greater distance.

I confess that writing has always been, and is even now, a slow, clumsy, and laborious process for getting a permanent record of our swiftly moving and evanescent thoughts, and that there is need of something better. It may be that the phonograph and dictaphone will ultimately make it unnecessary to transcribe in our present slow and laborious fashion; and I for one would welcome any scientific inventions which will make it easier for our recording instruments to keep pace with the mind. But I venture also to believe that for accurate thinking it is not a bad thing to have this drag upon the brain, and that to school the mind to keep pace with the pen is an excellent training for exact thought.

And so I return to my suggestion that, in order to remove this reproach from which the present generation suffers, which attaches particularly to professional students, and not least among them to medical men, we have to exercise ourselves constantly in the practice of lucid thinking by exercising ourselves in the practice of lucid writing. Schools and universities have their

debating clubs and societies, in which any one can get valuable practice in speaking and learn by experience to express himself fluently and clearly and suffer for his sins if he does not do so. It is a pity that there are no societies which give a young man precisely the same valuable training in the use of the pen; and if any school or college will introduce a fashion for this sort of thing, I believe that a great public service will be done. There was a time when the magazines were addicted to symposia and induced prominent authors to take part in a written discussion on some topic of general interest: then one could at any rate see how accomplished masters of the art could wield the pen. A better thing would have been for the readers to do it themselves, just as it is a better thing to play cricket and football than merely to look on at cricket and football matches.

Failing this, there is a course which every one may easily pursue, and that is to get in the habit of seeing that every sentence which he is called upon to write is lucid; and the best way of acquiring this faculty is to keep what you have written and read it again in the cold light of reason, and when your mind is not full of the subject as it was when you wrote.

Most of the failures to be lucid are due to the habit of confusing what we think with what we write; and to imagine that because a thing is in the mind it is also on the paper.

It is a common experience that in some respects, and for the minor errors, an author is the worst person to correct his own proofs; he knows what he meant to write, and he actually thinks that it is there, and fails to see the mistake. In the same way, each man is a bad critic of his own writing. This is the reason why I began by suggesting that you should first get a candid friend to be your critic; and, failing him, this is why I suggest that you should read the written page at some time when you are not biassed by thinking of the subject rather than of the manner in which it is expressed.

The worst sinners of all are some of the scientific writers, and it is a standing reproach to science that at this period of its existence it is marred by so many ill-written, ill-constructed, and unintelligible books and papers. It was fortunate that in the earlier days of the great movement in the last century science enjoyed the aid of so many excellent writers. Davy, Faraday, Lyell, Darwin were such clear thinkers that they could not fail to be clear writers; but it was well, also, that somewhat later the public ear was caught by such graceful and skilful writers as Tyndall and Huxley. With them we find lucidity coupled with the graces of style, and since their day there have been many accomplished authors who have managed to make a textbook or an abstruse memoir delightful by their powers of expression. Even a mathematical textbook may charm by its manner—witness those of Dr. Salmon, who was equally accomplished as a mathematician and a theologian; and Clerk Maxwell showed in his little book, *Matter and Motion*, how the most advanced mathematical reasoning can be expressed in the most simple and lucid language. In the same way, was not Gladstone able to invest a Budget speech with a certain literary charm?

Among scientific books it is curiously enough some of the translations which fail most ignominiously in the attempt to be lucid. Let me quote an example from the English translation of a very well known textbook which, in its original language, is quite clear and intelligible:

The successful scrutiny of the student of Nature reveals itself in finding out that which phenomena, apparently very diverse, have in common, and the results are the more brilliant, as the parallelized phenomena appear at the outset more diverse. The transference of observations from one case to another is naturally at first attended with some uncertainty, but with the repeated corroboration of the experiences in question there follows an ever-growing credibility until this transference finally attains to the rank of an empirical law of Nature.

I believe this simply means that a law of Nature is exhibited by comparing different natural events and finding what is common to them. The meaning of the sentence is entirely obscured by the introduction of unnecessary words. You will see that the fault here, and in similar instances which might be quoted by the hundred, is that the translator, in the endeavour to make his version sound well, knowing that the sense has been provided by the author and that he is not responsible for that, has even

inverted the perverted maxim of *Alice in Wonderland* and adopted for his guide, "Take care of the sound and the sense will take care of itself."

Rather than incur the danger of falling into such bad habits let us, with Biron in *Love's Labour's Lost*, decide to express ourselves "In russet yeas and honest kersey noes."

In the days of the scientific revival of the nineteenth century, the great expositors who wrote with such admirable lucidity did much to facilitate the introduction of science into ordinary education; for it appeared—as, indeed, was really the case—that the accurate habits of thought encouraged by the study of science found their expression in this clear writing; and this led many people to see that the study of science, like that of philosophy, is an education in clear thinking. But now that much of the scientific writing is so badly expressed there is danger lest the opposite conclusion be drawn, and the impression is conveyed that the studies which lead to such loose writing cannot really be conducive to accurate and clear thought.

Let me, then, in the interests of science in general, and of medical science in particular, if it is to earn the respect of the multitude—in your own interests if you wish to acquire habits of exact thought, and so to become leaders in the advance of medical science—repeat my suggestion that you should by constant practice in everything that you write, by constant and critical inquiry whether its meaning is clear, cultivate the desirable quality of lucidity.

OPENING CEREMONIES AT THE MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S men esteem themselves favoured of the gods in a good many connexions, and they are certainly fortunate when, usually as somewhat senior men, they flock into the famous Great Hall of the hospital for the October gathering of old students. There is a great difference between meeting old friends in some public caravansary and meeting them in a chamber which, vast though its proportions be, is practically the family dining room. The family spirit, in short, pervades the gathering at St. Bartholomew's from beginning to end of the evening. It was attended this year by the presidents of the Royal College of Surgeons and the Royal College of Physicians, the Master of the Society of Apothecaries, the Directors-General of the Medical Department of the Royal Navy, and H.M. Army, the Regius Professor of Medicine at Cambridge, the Master of Downing, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, the President of the Midwives Board, and the High Master of St. Paul's.

Mr. WALTER JESSOP, now Senior Ophthalmic Surgeon of the Hospital, was in the chair, and, in proposing the toast of the evening, said that just thirty years had passed since he had first been present at one of the October gatherings. On that occasion the chair was taken by Sir William Church, and the date—1881—marked what had proved to be the high-water mark of the financial success of the school; for the great repute which the school then enjoyed and which it still strove steadfastly and successfully to retain was the outcome of what was a comparatively simple organization as compared with that existing at the present time. The study of pathology, at that time limited to a weekly summer lecture, now had solely devoted to its service an enormous building and a very large staff, while similarly generous provision had been made for other comparatively new departments of medical science. The expenses of the school had grown correspondingly, and its constantly fluctuating income at times barely afforded a living wage to its greatly enlarged staff. Such a wage ought to be secured, and the committee of the school thought it could be secured if certain steps were taken. There was reason to believe that if there had been any permanently organized body representative of the school, the school might have already benefited by being made the recipient of bequests from old friends, and that it would still benefit in this way if such a body came into existence. It was, therefore, proposed to endeavour to obtain from the patron of

the hospital, His Majesty the King, a charter authorizing incorporation of the school. The necessary application would not, however, willingly be made unless it were felt that it had behind it the sympathy and good wishes of the treasurer and almoners of the hospital, and it was not yet known whether these would be forthcoming. He did not think that the plan would affect the hospital unfavourably, for, apart from the fact that its interests and those of the school were inseparably bound up together, those who felt disposed to benefit the school would be likely to desire to benefit the hospital likewise. In the same connexion Mr. Jessop mentioned that the Lawrence family, descendants of one of the greatest surgeons the hospital had ever possessed, had recently brought up the amount of the scholarships maintained by it to £115 a year. The balance of his speech was devoted to reminiscences and to a record of the honours won by the school at examinations and in sports, and to an annotated list of old students of the school and active and consulting members of the staff whom His Majesty the King had recently honoured. The names included those of Sir Henry Butlin, Bart., Sir Anthony Bowlby, Sir Frederic Eve, Sir Frederick Wallis, Sir George Newman, Surgeon-General Lukis, Director-General, I.M.S., and Colonel Raglan Thomas, R.A.M.C. (T.).

LORD SANDHURST, the treasurer of the hospital, in his reply, said that there seemed a general impression among the public that St. Bartholomew's was a very rich institution. This was true in a measure, since it owned very large properties, but the charges falling on these properties were so great and, in consequence of modern legislation, tended so materially to increase, that as a matter of fact the hospital was really poor. Indeed, despite everything that he and the almoners could do, its income had for several years fallen short of inevitable expenditure by upwards of £10,000 a year. In the circumstances it was impossible to do everything for the hospital which was desirable, or to afford to the school the full measure of support that the services rendered by it deserved. So far, however, as the scheme for a charter was concerned, he could say that it would receive every assistance that he himself and his colleagues could afford it.

The toast to "The Guests" was proposed by Dr. NORMAN MOORE, who spoke of St. Bartholomew's Hospital as a place which surpassed in its hospitality all other institutions in a city renowned throughout the world for its performances in that direction. Other hosts in the City of London were occasionally guests, but St. Bartholomew's was ever a host and never a guest. Moreover, it laid no restrictions on the guise or fashion of arrival of those who sought its doors, and for upwards of 700 years the chimneys of its hospitable kitchens had never ceased smoking. He then alluded in turn to each of the guests of the evening, and weighed with an attractive mixture of humour, erudition, and gentle sarcasm the claims which each of them might be considered to possess to respond to the toast for his fellows. Finally he allotted the task to Sir William Collins, on the ground that although Vice-Chancellor of the junior university represented at the dinner he was a man who had proved his ability to deal verbally with complex questions by joining the London County Council and rising to the position of Chairman, while in the House of Commons he had become one of those members to whom both parties were always ready to listen. In addition, he was a man known for his steadfast loyalty to both his old school and to his private friends.

Sir WILLIAM COLLINS accepted the challenge for an unexpected speech and the task of responding for his fellow guests very gracefully. It was perfectly true, he said, that he represented a junior university, and one which everybody had been endeavouring to reform, each by trying to pull its Senate in a different direction. Sooner or later some degree of equilibrium between the forces might be established, and no one would be better pleased than himself if the net outcome were to bring the University of London into still closer relation with London's medical schools. As to his departure from the beaten track ordinarily followed by medical men, he had been influenced by a strong feeling that the medical profession ought to play a much more active part than it had done in the management of the affairs of the nation. The training of medical men distinctly fitted them to deal