

that were being taken. In the third instance, an Institute reading-room under the care of Friends, and entirely sympathizing with the concern of the writer, notified the book and news agency through which the magazine objected to was obtained, that the subscription for the ensuing year would not be renewed. He also wrote to the publishers of the periodical his views of their moral accountability in sending into our homes the immodest, even indecent pictures, in which they seemed to delight.

The course taken in this third instance is undoubtedly the proper one to pursue if any diminution of the evil is to be looked for. With publications whose monthly issue may be tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands, it needs something more than the silent dropping out of a copy here and there because of dissatisfaction with the character of its contents, in order to make a convincing and salutary impression upon its editors, publishers and proprietors that their time and energies, in a degree, are being given to an unworthy business. There will certainly be no turn in the corrupting trend until parents, educators, religious bodies, and the religious press awaken to a realizing sense of their responsibility in permitting the debasement. If one will visit a public library, and taking down the bound volumes of the popular magazines of a generation, or even a decade ago, examine the line of their illustrations, and compare it with those so common at the present day, he will readily perceive that there has been a change in the particular indicated which calls for a severe condemnation and a striving for prompt amendment. As pointed out in the writer's recent paper on "The Relation of the Press and the Stage to Purity," welcome accorded the stage, and everything pertaining to it by the daily press at large, and by society in general, has very much to do with the

spread of this vicious pictorial reproduction. To quote :

"Obviously the stage is well entrenched behind and well protected by the daily papers—the popular magazines, likewise, being in a large degree its valuable supporters. In the latter connection I recall that one day last summer, while waiting at the house of a clergyman for the latter to appear, I looked through three of the magazines of the day that were on the parlor center-table, and they each contained an article about favorite actresses copiously illustrated, and in many cases seriously so. It must be acknowledged that in many clergymen's congregations a large proportion of the members or communicants patronize the play-house. Applicable just here is the query of the prophet of old to unfaithful Israel: 'And now what hast thou to do in the way of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor? or what hast thou to do in the way of Assyria, to drink the waters of the river?'"

The religious press, I am obliged to say, has hitherto been too often either carelessly or mischievously indiscriminating in calling favorable attention to the contents of some of the magazines, where words of truth and faithfulness in another strain were called for. It is possible for a great many individuals to be beneficially mindful, in this matter, of the apostle's counsel, "Be ye helpers one of another." The proprietor of one of the safest and most instructive of the illustrated monthlies—there may be no harm in saying that it was *The Chautauquan*—twice expressed thanks for a friendly remonstrance against an illustration such as it was, then promised should not again appear, pertinently adding, "Advertisers are ambitious to attract public attention, even if it is by doubtful and wicked methods. There are some very wicked people in this world who