AS WE SEE IT

By DAN PATRICK

Proving that the customers always write—and think they can be wrong too — is the following enterprising epistle which we quote in part:
Dear Mr. Patrick:

Your weekly column never fails to interest me, indeed it often irritates 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 us: past relations with Great Britain.

Let me state here that this is not intended as a defense of Mrs. Roosevelt — she seems to need no champions. But to deride 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 idea 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 man's liberty and equality.

As far as the War of 1812 is concerned, our immediate 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 plane of freedom, chose to ally ourselves, using the Louisiana territory, and with whom we, the champion that England was impressing our seamen.

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 change 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 actually Englishmen themselves, who [illegible] 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 taxing our patriots. (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 loot, land 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 British wholly unscrupulous.

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 Dawes, 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 I, like you to the point, is my equally noble re-

Cordially and respectfully,
RUFUS MAHER

Feast Days

[illegible]

STRANGE BUT TRUE

Little-Known Facts for Catholics

By M. J. MURRAY

The Literary Cavalcade

Immortal Mortal

By John O'Connor

The other evening time seemed to reverse itself. It was another spring and a grander world for a few hours. It smelled happy and looked of discovery, of mental stimulation, of new [illegible], and of old truth [illegible] and hard as diamonds [illegible] and hard. And [illegible] on the horizon of [illegible] happier days were like [illegible] of the versatile and [illegible] Hilaire Belloc.

It is a genuine pleasure to note that Sheed & Ward have finally collected [illegible] all of the poems of the greatest writer of our day. ("Sonnets and Verse" $2.50) Belloc is the most welcome friend you can possibly meet. He is the last living giant of the Catholic Revival.

Many of the old familiar Belloc poems are here—exclusive of the nursery rhymes, of course. Included for the first time in the "Heroic Poem in Praise of Wine" one of the immortal efforts of our day. Indeed, I can think of no one, including Chesterton, who might be able to write such a work. I first saw the latter when it was printed in London in 1931 and it has been a source of constant worry to me that methodists and champions of verse would omit it from their collections. But the publishers solved this and have included it where it belongs—with the rest of his work.

It has always seemed to me that our defensive attitude in this country has lead to an unbalanced evaluation of Belloc. Belloc is creative, positive. Too many have viewed him solely as a controversialist, an historian, or a firm friend of Chesterton. Yet, more discerning critics, outside the Church in many cases, aware of his technique and subtle command of word power, strongly agree that Belloc will be read throughout the years. Hilaire Belloc, that magician of English prose, must rank in the first rank of verse opposite to Hopkins.

Who, and . . . the editorial [illegible] of the present day, there [illegible] the [illegible] Belloc's equal? Who [illegible] Belloc's equal in humanity? Be he himself likely? [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]