

of the additional stations, by offering suggestions as to the best localities in the Virgin Islands in which to establish them, as well as offering to act as weather observers, or by suggesting the names of desirable persons for such duties.

All communications with regard to this subject should be addressed to the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

To the Editor of the "St. Croix Avis".

In today's "Avis" you treat editorially my controversy with Mr. Svendsen; but why use the name of poor old Svendsen any longer? He is simply the fence behind which a combine is standing. Any one can see that.

I have not the time to devote to the training of this combine in elementary logic, let me give you a specimen of their reasoning "you made a statement": "If you were not to put on a film treating the subject the title proclaimed then the title was used simply to catch the people as it carried with it the promise of something salacious." The combine then argues that it follows as a necessary conclusion that the people could be caught. Poor old logic!!

A fisherman goes out at night supplied with bait hoping to make a good catch of fish. It repeatedly occurs that the fish will not allow themselves to be caught. In other words they will not bite.

Frequently we hear the fisherman say: "Fishing is poor, the fish will not bite, although I had a splendid bait." Surely it was the intention of the fisherman to catch the fish, and he hoped to make a good haul, but there was no bilateral contract, as the fish would not cooperate. Commercializers of moving pictures want to catch the people. They are not in that business for the good of their health. They want to swell their financial income. They are looking for big dividends. Therefore they commercialize a title they hope will catch the people. The title is to be the bait. The house must be packed and to secure that the title must have "peo" in it.

There is my contention that the title is used to catch the people.

I did not say the people of Christiansted wanted to be caught or that they were caught. I did not say that the people were ready to rush or that they did rush to the theatre Aug. 18th. From what I hear the title was not an attractive bait, that the house was not crowded and there was no demand for repetition on Tuesday.

That reflects credit on the moral sense of the people of Christiansted. I have never said nor implied the people here have suffered by comparison with people elsewhere. But I have said publicly and repeatedly that you will find here people as noble, as good and as true as you will find anywhere.

Mr. Editor: it is quite evident to me that contributions to your columns can now serve no other purpose but to increase the sale of your paper. As far as I am concerned the controversy ends today. The Editorial in today's paper and the letters over Mr. Svendsen's signature can show a striking similarity of style. In other words the editor has the decided advantage of making editorially favorable comments on his own letters and disparaging remarks about my contributions. That is a rather unprecedented move in journalism. It is guerilla warfare once more. I have made unequivocal statements as to where I stand on the moving picture question. First, last and always I am in for pictures that have an educational value and for films that give innocent amusement. I am first, last and always against pictures that soil the hearts of children, or encourage youth in a down-hill course or confirm in crime those who have made poor of their lives. I am first, last and always against commercializing a title that has no higher motive than door-receipts.

JOSEPH W. DAILY.

Christiansted, St. Croix, V. I.
September 5, 1919.

To Mr. Daily.

1. You inquire who is the man hiding behind me: I must tell you, it is not one man, but a considerably larger section of the community than you imagine.

2. Birth Control even in your understanding of the word, might relate to the registering of births in an office, and be comical as well as purely innocent, and decidedly need not suggest anything filthy. In this case, "your conclusion is broader than its premises."

3. A joke I heard on board a Trans-Atlantic steamer on entering the harbor of New York, and related to you as a joke, you have repeated as my own personal statement. This you will recall was mentioned in a conversation with you when you expressed yourself as an opponent of prohibition which you explained to me as having been introduced into the United States principally through wealthy influences which aimed at placing some substitute on the market. As regards the principles I defended on that occasion, and which you claim could not be tolerated in any respectable community, I must say that the principles I defended were that an illegitimately born person was not an unclean person which was your opinion. And you even gave me as an example that should it be discovered that a man studying at the Catholic Theological Seminary for the priesthood was illegitimate, he would be immediately expelled, against which I protested as entirely unreasonable. You also gave an example of a woman who had come to you with two small children

for pecuniary assistance, and who you told me you drove away when you discovered that the children were illegitimate. Had it been the Salvation Army that woman had applied to, her needs would have been investigated and help given regardless of her social standing.

4. Your claim in answer to paragraph 2 of my letter is that I do not know very far and you know the opposite to be true. Here you are lowering again your standard of language to the same level as that in the discussion with Mr. Mayhew. Kindly uphold a polite tone. You appear to have the opinion that you have come to an island where the people are uncultivated that you can act and speak as you please.

5. In your answer to paragraph 3 of my letter, you contradict that "I repeatedly asserted that I had projected the pictures the preceding night". In this connection you are deliberately trampling the truth underfoot. My wife and I are willing to take our oath upon my having twice made the assertion you refute.

6. You claim that paragraph 4 of my letter constitutes a weak foundation upon which to construct an argument. I now ask you frankly: Did you or did you not suggest to the official that the film was immoral?

7. Replying to paragraph 5 of my letter you ought to have been able to see that I was "big enough, had learned enough, and knew enough English to conclude from the context that perfective was a typographical error."

8. You deny that everybody who has seen the pictures agrees they are absolutely harmless; but the only person to whom you have referred denies to have given such verdict to you about the pictures, or to have said "that he would not wish his children to witness certain features of the film".

It seems to be Mr. Daily that you have gone far from the original question in this case.

You have accused me for having exhibited immoral pictures and brought as proof for your accusation a man who is represented as saying that he would not like his children to see certain features of the film, but who emphatically denies ever having told you so. This is the question, and the only question in this case, and if you are unable to advance better evidence for your accusation then it would be better that we drop the subject, as I am satisfied that the public is very well convinced of who is right or wrong in this matter.

Respectfully,

EINAR SVENDSEN.

As I was strolling on "Plaza Williams" this morning I saw one of our editors, towel on arm, coming from the bath-house. It must be necessary for the editors to keep cool in these days.

OBSERVER.