

HOMŒOPATHY.

20

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS.

Sir.—There was once a great and good man whose object in life was to reform the abuses and superstitions of the age in which he lived. His teachings were altogether at variance with those which had been in use for thousands of years—indeed, they were so simple that they could not be understood, nor would they be believed in. Therefore they were ridiculed, and the teacher declared to be mad, and worthy of death. In argument with some of those who "laughed him to scorn," and whose interests it was to get rid of the new doctrines, he made use of these words—"Though ye believe not me, believe the works."

In the discussion upon homœopathy we read on one side those who laugh at the new system of treating diseases asking what good it has done, and stating that it is not recognised by the various colleges of medicine. On the other side it is stated that this great man is a believer in homœopathy, and that that great man practises it. Now, I have from time to time seen offers made by the homœopaths to test the value of their mode of treatment, and asking that a ward in the Melbourne Hospital be placed apart especially for the homœopathic doctors, and a similar one for the allopathic doctors; then see, by the percentage of cured or otherwise, which is most successful. In the allopathic adherents refusing to do this it looks like fear. But until this be done the public will always be in doubt as to which system is the safest, surest, and least expensive. II.

Jan. 20.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS.

Sir.—As you have inserted the letter of "Jalap" in to-day's issue of *The Argus*, I think I may (in common fairness) ask you to allow me sufficient space for a brief reply.

1. In speaking of the relative number of allopathic and homœopathic physicians possessing the M.D., only those degrees granted by the English and Scotch universities formed the basis of my calculation.

2. Does "Jalap" constitute himself arbiter of the accuracy of the opinions of Archbishop Whately? I do not think your correspondent is warranted in describing the belief of that great man in homœopathy as "an error of judgment."

3. Surely "Jalap" is not illogical enough to believe that because the Congress of America introduced an injurious tariff its other measures must necessarily be ill-advised.

4. "Jalap" places a note of interrogation after the adjective in my remark about many homœopaths being "intelligent people."

I will use another, and ask is this not a piece of impertinence, that could emanate only from one who takes it upon himself to characterise the well-considered opinion of such a man as the archbishop as "an error of judgment."

—I am, Sir, yours, &c.,
HOMŒOPATHICUS.