

piritual allegiance to the pope and, at the same time either were good American patriots or foreigners who helped put America on the map and keep her there. Did you ever hear of these Catholics, Guardian, whom you would condemn if they were here today, with no opportunity to show their patriotism?

Stephen Moylan, brother of bishop of Cork and commissary general in Washington's army.

Commodore Barry, father of U. S. navy.

De Rochambeau, French Catholic in the revolution.

Admiral De Grasse, who defeated the British navy at Yorktown.

Kosciuszko, the gallant Pole.

Chas. Carroll, who sought the help of Canada for the U. S. A.

Lafayette, who gave us men and money.

Pulaski, another brave Pole.

And last, but not least, in our civil war, Phil Sheridan.

There you are, Guardian. You won't find their deeds recorded in your G. of L. literature, but in our country's history their names are written in gold. — Jack Doyle, 1953 Leland Av.

TO ALLEN STEVEN.—Your tribute to motherhood is fine. The old idea that a woman is a slave is surely in rapid decline when so often the truth is printed. She who is engaged in bringing a child into this world is in holy service and any law or lack of law which brings her hardship is a curse upon society.

Motherhood and the sex instincts are some of the strongest things in nature, and any set of laws which require a woman to have a license before acting upon these instincts is as absurd as to require one to have a license to breathe. I have had an article on the same subject written for some time to send to The Day book and will copy it and send it in as soon as possible.

I hope it will help to make more

people see that motherhood is a wonderful thing and worthy of the highest respect, whether it carries a license tag or not. What is the seal of the law beside the great seal of nature? Interference with the laws of nature causes unnatural life.— J. S. Davis.

PERVERTED SOCIETY.—I am prompted by the big fuss made over the discovery of the so-called \$1,000,000 swindle to say a few words in behalf of those in jail accused of such crime. In my estimation those fellows are not such terrible criminals after all. They are a bunch of cowards that betrayed the confidence of a frail-minded set of women. The notoriety given to such degenerate affair is harmful to whatever is left of public morality, as it will show the way to some smart youths how to catch prey, while it does not in any way lessen the possibilities of the game.

As above stated, that gang's crime is betrayal of trust and cowardice. The exacting of money is no crime. If it is, then our high-standing Board of Trade gamblers are in the same category. What's the difference 'twixt those blackmailers and a handful of men that fix prices of public commodities and tell us: Here you have to pay our price or starve? Is there any difference between moral starvation and real in comparing the two cases? Moral starvation was the alternative given the victims of the swindlers for a stipulated price; real starvation is the alternative given the people by a few legal blackmailers for a stipulated price.

So there you are. According to the stories printed, the victims of the swindlers were women of wealth. Well, the wealthy get theirs by legal blackmail, and, of course, they found their peers in a band of other smart exploiters. Those men are brainy fellows. That they choose such career is the outcome of our perverted society.—John Zouboulakis.