

What I say is that if we are to embrace socialism, which means the end of liberty, either by our own act or by having it forced upon us from within--a method always hitherto effective in other countries--then there would seem to be no reason why we should sacrifice the best of our manhood in the process of preserving a liberty which is at once to be thrown away. In this subject I have some interest.

You consistently ignore the argument which in my judgment totally answers your contention. It appears in my last letter as follows:

"Your third reason is that even if private enterprise is to be extinguished, we should prefer to live under what you call "a constitutional socialist regime" than under the Nazi heel. My contention, which I thought I argued out thoroughly was this; that there can be no such thing as a 'constitutional socialist regime,' for the reason that if the form of such a thing is erected it cannot function except by the use of force in all its manifestations. I showed that it had never been constituted in any country except by force, and maintained by force, and that the aggregate of the world's work as performed today by the world's millions can be achieved only in one of two ways: (1) by a reward to the worker in the way of property earned, or (2) by force. I do not think that governmental authority, however erected, which functions by force and bloodshed, and which is accompanied by starvation--for starvation has always ensued and must ensue under any socialistic regime--is worth the blood of our sons merely because the authors of these ghastly consequences are to be Anglo-Saxons."

It may be worth while to supplement the above by quoting from Maurois in his "Life of Chateaubriand":

"Chateaubriand heralded Socialism. He half realized that socialist equality could assert itself only through despotism and dictatorship, that the remedy would be worse than the ill, and that the abolition of personal property would lead to a slavery, to which history 'however far one delves into the past can show nothing comparable.'"

Maurois then quoted Chateaubriand, himself, as follows:

"Weary of private property, do you wish to make the government sole owner, distributing to a beggared community a share proportioned to the deserts of every individual? Who is to judge of those deserts? Who will have the power and authority to execute your decisions? Who is to hold this bank of living chattels and turn it to account? Make no mistake, without individual property none are free. Property is none other than liberty."

It may be a popular form of attack, but it is no answer to reason and to the lessons of history merely to describe me as a defender of "Capitalism."

Yours truly,
(Signed) Arthur Meighen.

AM/E.