

enough and to spare. In some ways an autocracy, or such a *régime* of strong centralized government as obtains now in Germany, is doubtless more favorable to the just authority of the expert than our own more liberal constitution. On the other hand, we must always remember that science is made for man, not man for science. In other words, we must not disdain to justify our assertions when challenged by ignorance or mistrust, since what we desire is not sullen acquiescence but willing and intelligent co-operation. For we, too, are fallible, and have, in fact, if we know the history of our calling, to admit conviction of not a few gross errors very confidently and unanimously proclaimed as indubitable truths in their day. The expert, *quâ* expert, is a man of his own generation, sharing not only its knowledge and skill but also its prejudices and limitations. What he sees he sees very clearly; what he does not see he is too apt to ignore, and somewhat rashly and prematurely to deny. In so doing he runs the risk of being falsified by the event, for the vague possibilities of to-day are often the platitudinous verities of to-morrow.

Consider, for example, the astonishing revolution which has overtaken medical opinion as to the role of alcohol in health and disease. Fifty years ago we were practically unanimous in asserting the value, nay, even the necessity of stimulants for those who enjoyed and would continue to enjoy good health, while in almost every disease which we were called upon to treat they were freely and fearlessly proscribed. The question in those days was not of alcohol or no alcohol, but merely in what form and how much. Only the other day I saw quoted in a daily newspaper the no doubt self-forgotten dictum of a great and justly revered physiologist, still amongst us, to the effect that no man could enjoy real health and strength without the regular use of alcoholic beverages. In saying this the physiologist in question did not really speak as an expert, but uttered a dogmatic, and, as it happens, erroneous opinion. But the public would of course conclude at the time that so definite an assertion, coming from an acknowledged authority upon the subject of health and its conditions, was based upon substantial and verifiable grounds.

The expert owes it not only to himself but to science to distinguish clearly in his own mind, and above all in his utterance, between those conclusions which are firmly based upon irrefutable evidence and those which are mere opinions awaiting the verdict of time. Strictly speaking, there is in the scientific sphere no recognition of the claims of authority, every result stands or falls according to the objective quality of the evidence available in its behalf. A very good corrective of the narrow tendency of the specializing expert's work is the due cultivation of what is