



## AS WE SEE IT

By DAN PATRICK

Proving that the colonists always write—and that they can be wrong too—is the following surprising episode which we quote in part:

Dear Mr. Patrick,

Your weekly column never fails to interest me—indeed it often troubles me, as perhaps it is intended to, treating as it so often does of controversial topics. This week's article, attacking Eleanor Roosevelt's article, impels me to submit to you my opinion on the subject of American education regarding our past relations with Great Britain.

Let me state here that this is not intended as a defense of Mrs. Roosevelt, who seems to need no champions. But to defend her statements merely because she made them is hardly profound or logical.

Regarding the Revolution against Great Britain—of course we (or rather the Englishmen who lived here at that time) did rebel against and defeat the British troops who were sent here. But why must our school history books tell the story of that rebellion as though it were an entirely glorious patriotic effort on our part, and a tyrannical, contemptible demonstration of British greed on the other?

You certainly are aware that only a very small group of the colonists entertained and fostered the authority. It proved eventually to be a successful movement was largely one of defiance of constituted states of independence in the beginning, and that the revolution, with complete separation from Britain as the result, but our school histories pretend that it started as a patriotic movement by high-minded, and earnest men, whose only thought was to give to the world the idea of men's liberty and equality.

As far as the War of 1812 is concerned, our inaugurate president, James Madison, chose to attack England when she was engaged in a struggle for survival against the tyrant Bonaparte, with whom we (or rather the liberated Englishmen who lived here then) had made an infamous bargain for the pions of freedom, chose to ally ourselves, using the Louisiana territory, and with whom we, the championed that England was impeding our success.

Regarding the Civil War, whether England would have joined the South in its struggle against (in the opinion of the rebels) the same kind of tyranny America had fought four score and seven years previously, that is conjecture, and not history.

How would Mrs. Roosevelt have history written so as to steam up American children to love and worship Great Britain, you ask? Perhaps she would choose the words "love and worship," as you have, but I should think she might suggest that our school histories mention the fact that the American patriots were not a separate people, but were actually Englishmen themselves, who had a desire to take part in the making of laws which governed them.

When I went to school, I was given the impression that the Americans were a separate nation who fought England to prevent her from taking our patriotic. (And if you gather from this that I was not learning what the books and teachers were trying to teach me, I must, in all modesty, confess that I received 100% in both parochial and high school final examinations in American History.)

I have since concluded that most of the "patriots" were rabble who never paid any taxes, who looked upon the Revolution as a field day for robbing and humiliating the "Tories" who had either wealth or position, and who were propagandized into fighting by a group of selfish and shrewd opportunists, such as Sam Adams, with the promise of reward in losing and political favors.

Perhaps I should hasten to point out that I am not a Tory—in fact, I did not live here during the Revolution, nor did my ancestors. The results of the Revolution have been glorious, but its origin was not wholly so, nor were the English wholly innocent.

You make a point of our failure to get our money back from Britain following World War I. You must recall how our government sent a fellow named Dewar, and another named Young to Europe to help prepare a plan for adjusting the indemnities due to France and England from Germany. The result of this plan seems to have been that nobody got his money back.

Mrs. Roosevelt is a card, you observe. One that is able to stay in the game, is my equally astute rejoinder.

Cordially and respectfully,  
RUFUS MURRAY

My correspondence read the column of last week more carefully than I would have done—but that we never know the critics.

(1) That the colonists fought well is beyond question from the New York Daily News—a fact which we usually pointed out at the very outset.

As for Mr. Murray's thesis with which we thoroughly disagree we leave it to historians more qualified than we to decide his statements. (1) that most of the Americans who fought in the Revolution were "rabble who never paid any taxes," (2) that James Madison was "treacherous," (3) that the Englishmen who fought in the Revolution "were not a separate people, but were actually Englishmen themselves," (4) that the English were not on the side of freedom when they fought in the Civil War.

## Feast Days

THE CATHOLIC COURIER  
Editor: Rev. W. J. Murray  
Business Manager: H. J. Murphy  
Subscription: \$1.00 per year  
Address: 100 Main Street, Rochester, N.Y.

## STRANGE BUT TRUE Little-Known Facts for Catholics

W. J. MURRAY

BY W. J. MURRAY