

to public attention through the medium of newspapers, magazines and other influential organs of public opinion is an important one. Such a means of making even a few truth-telling words and names common knowledge, is of the greatest service. To be effective I believe the following principles should be followed. First, the information must have the sanction of a central authoritative source, which can standardize it and give it a positive quality. All through the medical field of the genital infections there are seeming contradictions and variations in method and opinion which are extremely confusing to the uninitiated. When doctors disagree, the unfortunate layman, lacking the power to interpret, is thrown into perplexities which leave him in doubt as to whether there is such a thing as real knowledge on the subject. The point over which the disagreement occurs may be trivial, and the wrangle purely scholastic, but it breaks down the confidence in leadership which promotes effective public action. Other obvious requirements of a written propaganda are the judicious but not vulgar use of the vernacular, precisely as in lectures, and the avoidance of technicality. Written material on health matters should not attempt to deal with treatment except to outline general principles and minimum requirements. If it does more than this, it belongs on the same plane as the practice of medicine by correspondence, which can become an insidious and vicious form of quackery to which the columns of many newspapers subscribe even while they ostensibly exclude untrustworthy and disreputable medical advertising. Printed propaganda must steer between the tendency to over-emotionalism that paints up genital infections and hangs them in a verbal gallery of horrors, and the dry-as-dust presentation of medical facts. It should never be forgotten, that in print there is no human voice, no compelling eye, no sharp incisive gesture that drives a point home to an intent audience. The vivid and dramatic in life, unskilfully managed, too often sounds like "sob-stuff" on paper, and a tension and tone that can be safely carried, man to man, fails of effect when mixed with ink. I think too, that writing on medical subjects is a form of special pleading which should so far as possible be directed at a specific audience. The effort to make material of this kind into a single-standard literary pabulum that all who run may read, makes it effective only for the middle third of the world audience, affronts the intelligence of the upper portions and flies over the heads of the lower portions. Italicizing and scarehead typography, too, while they may, like the loudly printed handbills, draw a crowd, detract in the end from the force of the presentation by robbing it of dignity. Where force of this sort must be evoked it should be exerted personally and not in print. I believe, too, that convincing material for a medical propaganda can best be written by those whose special experience and enthusiasm make their thumb-nail graphic touches true to life. Much of the literature on sex questions is flabby. It seems to lack genuineness because it is abstract. It is the specific instance, told with the art of the *raconteur*, and a proper touch on lights and shadows, that etches in the image which inspires action.

*Laws and Law Enforcement; Compulsory Treatment.*—It is worth while to say a word or two on the need for new laws and law enforcement in the modern campaign against syphilis and gonorrhœa, since the influence of intelligent men and women can go far toward shaping such