reasons which induced Thebes to attack Plataea. Once the Russian Army is on the Atlantic seaboard its first imperative duty would be to destroy the British Isles, already occupied in peace-time by American forces and destined, in wartime, to become the springboard for American counter-attacks. Since 1945 there has been no military answer to this danger, nor is it likely that one will be found for several years to come.

Just to ask for peace or merely to declare in favour of peace is pious and meaningless. Peace societies should bear this in mind. Peace will not be had without a struggle and without a policy. The policy is before you, the struggle is waiting for combatants. It is my profound belief that if movements like that for the United Socialist States of Europe made a Policy for Peace one of its main platforms, its praiseworthy aims would more rapidly gain popular support.

It is also expecting a great deal from the State Department and American public opinion to weaken American strategy for humanitarian motives towards Western Europe when no strong clamour for it is reaching American ears from our side. The problem is therefore closely linked with a revival of European faith in its own value and its own future, which means setting our teeth to find workable and just solutions to the great problems of our century. But only peace can allow us to work these out. Those who struggled to save the peace when the Nazi threat to it become more evident from year to year will remember that in the 'thirties the so-called democracies lacked in moral strength because they had no real alternative to oppose to the evil dynamism—nonetheless dynamism—provided by Fascism.

Our present efforts may prove just as vain but the alternative is to abandon consciousness, to sink into the suicidal decadence of our age and to slide meekly towards our annihilation. Many moral battles have been lost, more defeats are to come, but for those who retain their belief in humanity there is the consolation that each defeat will add to the armour which will enable progress to win its final and lasting victory.

CORRESPONDENCE

Remark on Equality

The Editor, "Liberty,"

In his article "Accent on Equality" Wigham quotes a sentence written by Engels in his *Anti-Dühring*, and he derives from it that Engels was against equality of pay in socialist society. It must be remarked first that when Marx or Engels gave their ideas about the future this is no indication of what the workers will have to do under socialism; predictions are no prescriptions. And secondly

that here Engels does not speak about socialist future but on the ideas, the demands, and the platform of the working class under capitalism. Against the confused expositions of Dühring on equality as an "eternal truth" he emphasises that ideas on equality are themselves products of social conditions. The proletarian demand for equality was first a reaction against the horrible contrasts between rich and poor, then a protest against the middle-class sham-demand of social equality unrealisable under capitalism. "In both cases the real content of the proletarian demand for equality is the demand for the abolition of classes. Any demand for equality which goes beyond that must needs pass into absurdity." For under capitalism and against capitalism you can demand nothing more essential, more definite, more encompassing than abolition of classes, i.e., abolition of all exploitation. What to simple minds appears as the antagonism between rich and poor, is in reality the class-antagonism between the exploiting owners of the production apparatus and the non-possessing exploited workers. If the capitalist should speak of his earnings as being of the same kind, only (due to his greater capability) larger than the workers' earnings, the class-conscious worker does not reply: "Equality is a command of justice." He replies: "Your income and mine are fundamentally different in character, namely profit and wage, because we are different classes; you, the employers, are the exploiting, we, the workers, the exploited class. And we demand, and fight for, mastery over the production apparatus, whereby under common ownership in a class-less society true equality will be established." Thus what Engels did was to turn the attention from a surface phenomenon to the deep economic essence of society.

The Communist Appeal to Engels

So the Russian official (or his Communist Party spokesman) when appealing to Engels' words, is entirely wrong. It is just the other way round. The Russian worker, instead of demanding equality of income (a senseless demand under state capitalism) should reply: "Your income and mine are fundamentally different in character, though both have the outer form of wage or salary, because we are of different classes; you, the high officials, are the exploiting, we, the workers the exploited class. What we have to demand (though unable to express it because we are gagged and fettered by dictatorial State power) is common ownership in a class-less society, in order that true equality be established." This is Engels' message to the Russian workers.

Engels and Equality under Socialism

There is, moreover, another place in Engels' *Anti-Dühring* where he incidentally expresses his ideas on equality under socialism. He treats there the fact that under capitalism skilled labour (that acts as "complicated" condensed labour) is more highly paid because the costs to produce and reproduce this labour power are

higher. Thus descending to the economic foundations of social institutions he says: "In a society of private producers they or their families pay the cost of instruction of the skilled labourer; hence to the private individuals falls directly the higher price of skilled labour-power; the skilled slave is sold at a higher price, the skilled wage-worker gets a higher wage. In a society organised on socialist lines society pays the costs, hence earns the fruits, the larger resulting value of complicated labour. *The worker himself has no claim to a higher reward.*" (Italics mine—A.P.) This may suffice. Engels says here that in a socialist society higher skill (e.g., scientific or leading capacities) affords no claim to a higher standard of life, since society itself has provided that capacity. Equality is inherent in abolition of class, in mastery of the workers over production; inequality, in Russia as well as in England, testifies to class-rule and class-exploitation. When in Russia the ruling bureaucracy awards itself high salaries, when in England highly-paid officials in nationalised industries try to impose upon the workers that this is socialism, they cannot pretend to have Engels on their side.

A. PANNEKOEK.

Planning for War

The Editor, "LEFT,"

I will begin with the postulate (a valid one) that any current idea, when overwhelmingly subscribed to, is more than likely to be wrong and false, or at any rate so suspect as to be worth careful investigation.

The prevailing belief, imposed on and accepted by all shades of political opinion (and none) is that the world is now divided between a hard-pressed "capitalism," with its back to the wall, and a challenging ideological opposite.

It is a human weakness on the one hand to grasp at what looks plausibly like what one wants to see, and on the other to fear the loss of what, equally plausibly, may look like the thing worth retaining. It is also a deeply-rooted faith that these apparent differences of objective can be settled by the processes of violence we call war.

Now war is a deliberately planned activity, ordained well ahead of its actual incidence; and the fundamental of it is that there shall be two "sides"; but it does not greatly matter what constitutes the ostensible "cause." This can be (has been successively) religion, land, markets, etc., as the cover for cupidity.

Why not, therefore, an ideological "peg" on which to hang it?

Deceptive Appearances

Provided that the people are prepared to be "prepared" for, and eventually engage in, organised slaughter, one cause is as good as another to the war-makers. An ideology which was genuinely