

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

“WE ENGLISH”

SIR,

I am not sure whether I am “ingenuous”; I am quite sure that I am impenitent:—

1. Since in his letter Mr. Louis Vincent actually uses the word *partner* of England’s position in the government or misgovernment of Ireland, I take it that he does not really differ from me.

2. Is he, however, correct when he states that the Irish and Scotch have been “employed” as “the tools or hirelings” of England? That is the whole matter in dispute. Is it correct, for example, to suppose that Ulster has been “the tool” of England? Would it be more correct to reverse the proposition and say that England has been “the tool” of Ulster? When Home Rule was shelved at the outbreak of war in 1914, which is more likely to have been “the tool,” Mr. Asquith or Lord Carson?

3. Finally, when he writes that “it is common knowledge that the practice of [Ireland’s] own superior Brehon Law was made treasonable,” he is begging the question with an epithet. I would most certainly deny that the superiority of Brehon Law over English Law is a matter of “common knowledge.”

Yours faithfully,

BEDE JARRETT, O.P.

DICKENS AND CATHOLICISM

SIR,

Miss Martineau’s Autobiography tells of the astonishing anti-popery of Dickens defended by Ley, in *The Dickens Circle* (Chapman and Hall, 1918, p. 324).

The matter was brought up in *The Month* (April, 1919).

No wonder Dickens refused to let anything be printed in favour of Catholicism, when, in 1846, he wrote of “Catholicity, clearly as a means of social degradation”; where-