The author of the Atlantic Monthly essay, "argument..." establishes its argument through analogy and logos. His use of personal opinions, coupled with an unwavering tone, help to establish his credibility.

The nature of his argument revolves around a trust in "a considerable number of intelligent people." The context is a discussion. He also believes in a privatization of art and material, rather than a censorship. His discussion of protecting certain sectors of society from seeing "evil" is a discussion that is relevant today, especially with the recent nudity over live television. Should we protect others from what we think is wrong? Is a discussion that is still relevant today.

With the growing concerns over free speech and democracy around the world, the author's arguments are relevant and important. However, some of his argument does, however, contain some flaws. His uncertainty during his reference to the statue in Pompeii shows through his use of "probably," discredit his historical reference. He argues, however, by presenting a plausible counter while his analogy serves well to argue his point. It does not take into account the difference between books and statues: statues are meant for public display, while books are not. They are only one reader to view its pages at a time, whereas intimate...
The author's sense of conformity for the benefit of the greater good is shown through his assertion that there is a "practical solution that will be accepted by everyone" and his lack of objection to the reservation of Balzac. The author's failure to leave out "I" from the article discredits himself as an objective source.

However, his argument seems sensible enough. Those who wish to see the objectionable statues may, so long as they request and obtain a key. This element to the argument is one that has drawn out considerable discussion over time: who holds the key? The author failed to address this question in one of his greatest faults and a pressing issue which distorts his essay from similar ones of today. The need to check and balance these in power is becoming ever evident with the recent release of prison guards in Iraq violating prisoner's human rights. How do we ensure the key is not thrown away once the statue is locked in the attic?

The continuing topic of censorship of artwork and images is still very relevant to today's society. However, the author's failure to address who holds the key and how to punish them removes his article from much of modern debate. His inability to seem like an objective commentator also means people who disagree with him will ignore his solution. His refusal to following the ideas of a "considerable hunter"
"Of intelligent people" has, in history, irrefutably lead to massacres of people, such as the Jews in Germany, and ideology such as Galileo's hypothesis of the earth revolving around the sun (his manuscripts were locked up in an attic at the Vatican too). WWII signified a revolt in the belief that it is okay to follow what a "considerable number of intelligent people" say making no argument less valid in today's post-WWII era. The author's proposal of a solution provides an interesting concept, but... The author's essay provides an interesting, but mostly inapplicable solution to a burning question in today's society, because the foundations for no solution are mostly inapplicable to today.
The writer for "The Atlantic Monthly" deals with the newly debated issue of displaying nude statues on the pros and cons that have been offered by members of society. Although later making an analogy to books that have been removed from circulation, the matter turns to one of personal choice. The author acknowledges that this issue will rarely be agreed upon and that only the precedence set by the named example may draw a conclusion.

The final and most important point the author makes is the changing perception of the public over time and how in fact, that is the source of the issue. The author immediately establishing in the first paragraph the complexity of the issue at hand; the reader can understand the clashing of viewpoints with regard to the display of nude statues. By highlighting that "morality will justify it for one set of reasons; after it will precede it for another" (23-24), one can see the difficulty of arriving at a conclusion. This is the author's only alternative through the example of censored books. That by appealing to public opinion, one artifact deemed offensive in one period may be widely accepted if another. The importance of acknowledging varying
viewpoints through the progression of time is key to the writer's argument. "His opinion, therefore, deserves respect, even though he may be, from my point of view, uncultivated, intolerant, and unreasonable."

The writer's assertion is most definitely true. For example, nudity in this day and age is not as widely celebrated as it had been in the romantic age. The rise of the supermodel has replaced the tiny-framed runway models. Attitudes and public perception change as new growing trends. This in the case of the bikini, they too should be adapted to widespread public opinion. But it is them public that should we untouched kept happy and content.

And in the event the trends no change - as is the slow return at fuller figures returning to the runways and criticism for skeletal size 2 figures grows may the return of previously uncultivated be celebrated. "If the statue is really good and pure, as despite the author's previous perceptions thousands of good people believe, it will, by and by, be brought down to the main hall."

However, despite the complexity of the issue, the author urges the reader to not make haste in their decisions or what may be perceived as a modern day society may pride itself on being open and accepting but we - are - closing - to - modern - trend.
opposition to a "code of morals" may
be greatly appreciated by another. Time changes
with perception.

*
For centuries, the issue of censorship has been endlessly debated. And the issue is still apparent in today's society. Should society be censored from certain materials and scenes? More recently, the article "The Atlantic Monthly" was written over one hundred years ago. In it, the author believes that certain scenes which are inappropriate to even some should be "given up" freely to the public. It is clear that through the censorship of today's society, this author had a valid point.

Censorship is seen all over society in today's world. Why do you think that there are ratings for movies? It is well aware that not all movies are appropriate for everyone in the general public. These "mature" scenes are "viewed" in a private theatre in which only those of the mature age can observe. If this point of censorship were not valid in today's society, there would be no need for ratings and movies would just be played on an outdoor screen available for all to see.
Censorship in libraries and bookstores is still apparent as it was one hundred years ago. Today's society still knows that not all literary materials are considered appropriate to everyone, and therefore still places those inappropriate items in places not as well publicized. Even today, when I walked into a book store, the magazines and books on pornography are placed on high shelves, above the view of the public eye. They are there if I wish to look at them, but they are still somewhat "reserved." I do not have to look up that high if I choose not to.

Censorship has always been a hot topic in society. The censorship today is debated just as it was one hundred years ago. Back then, the author of "The Atlantic Monthly" clearly demonstrated that scenes inappropriate from some should not be freely publicized, and from the censorship seen is in today's society, it is clear that he had a valid point.