The Hague has been decided upon as the place where the international conference called deceptively the "conference for the liquidation of war" is to be held.

The governments have taken sixty days to arrive at this choice, and the dispute clearly disclosed the divergent interests. The England of MacDonald apparently intended to create through the proposal, that London should be chosen as the place of the conference, a kind of precedent, and, at the same time, by this fact to put forward the English metropolis as the seat of the international bank which is to be founded.

However, the preparatory negotiations have now been concluded. Within a few days the delegates and their numerous retinues will probably be on their way to Holland.

The object of the negotiations at the conference will be the acceptance of the Young Plan or, rather, the execution of the protocol signed at Geneva in September, 1928, by France, England, Belgium, Japan, Italy and Germany. The protocol provided for the convocation of a committee of experts to work out a plan regulating the reparations and negotiations concerning the conditions of the evacuation of the Rhineland. Finally, it sanctioned the appointment of a commission, to which the control of the demilitarised Rhineland zone should be transferred.

The discussion will accordingly be concentrated upon the report of the experts and upon the two points mentioned above.

In accordance with the sacred principles of secret diplomacy, the negotiators are making use of their right to say nothing about the instructions with which they are setting out for the conference.

Upon being called upon by the Chamber for several explanations, Brand evaded them, and in justification cited, not without malice, the case of Henderson, who exercised similar reticence in the House of Commons.

In the meantime, there have occurred two political events, the significance of which should not be underestimated: the British view of the Young plan, as formulated by Snowden in the Lower House, and Poincaré's resignation.

The plan elaborated by Young, and confirmed by the conference after a number of crises, is a compromise between the claims of the creditors and the offers of the new-German imperialism. A fresh regulation of the German debt came into being and the political significance of this was pointed out by our Party in a special declaration several weeks ago. Although the new regulation reduces the nominal amount of the German debt, it not only fails to lighten but in a measure it adds to the burdens imposed on the proletariat. Nevertheless, agreement had to be arrived at concerning the sacrifice which the reduction of the German loan required of the allies. In particular, England had to agree to a reduction of its claims. Against the first reduction proposed by Owen Young, energetic resistance was made by W. Churchill, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time.

The Yankees, however, finally got the victory. The proportion of the annuity payable by Germany to England was reduced from 23 per cent, to 19 per cent. As compensation for the reduction of the duties made in the Young plan, which English industrialists regarded as a kind of dumping, England had to agree to a reduction of the reparation payments destined for the dominions and to renounce a portion of the occupation costs.

These concessions appear to the English statesmen to be an abuse. Lloyd George opened a strong attack upon the Young plan. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Snowden, stated in his answer to the leader of the Liberals that the sacrifice made by England was "enormous, magnanimous, quixotic," but that the limit had been reached. He added: "England is by no means obliged to accept the proposals of the Young Plan."

These statements should be compared with Stresemann's utterance in the German Reichstag that the Young Plan was a regulation for the duration of ten years, at the most. A significant confession!

Apart from the particular problem, the experts are disposed to come to a settlement in regard to the conflicts of the "third period of imperialism" and to consolidate the stabilisation of world capitalism. But even before their work is completed the chief parties are already beating a retreat.

The second event, whose significance prior to the international conference, must be explained, is the resignation of the Poincaré Cabinet.

The Socialists, who are always ready to cause confusion in the minds of the workers, are already proclaiming the resignation of the Cabinet and its substitution by the Briand government as a sign of a new direction in the foreign policy of France, and declaring that the "Ruhr policy" is giving way to the "Locarno policy!" It is not worth while discussing this twaddle.

What are now the worries of French imperialism, which are overshadowing all others?

a) Manoeuvring against American imperialism, whose policy loses the American market to most of the French articles of luxury and whose enormous overproduction leads to a kind of dumping on the continent of Europe with which French industry cannot cope.

b) Maintenance and strengthening of the alliances in the Balkans and in the East as preparatory measures for the fight against Italian imperialism and against the Soviet Union. Shortly before assuming office Briand boasted before the Senate that he presided at one of the greatest pillages in the interests of Poland (the division of Upper Silesia). On the same day he received Minister Zaleski and promised to support the claim of Poland to participate in the international conference.

c) Recruiting of Germany in the anti-Soviet block through agreement to evacuate Rhineland, subject to certain conditions.

d) Avoidance of a rupture with England, maintenance of the Anglo-French alliance, which is indispensable for the fight against the colonies, which are in a state of fermentation, for the support of the enemy-revolution in China and for the offensive against the Soviet Union.

e) Still closer participation of the Socialists in this policy: to send Boncour and Jouhaux again to the League of Nations.

This is the outward aspect of the parliamentary incident. It is hardly necessary to say that it will not make the slightest difference in the principles of French imperialism on the eve of the international conference. The Briand Ministry will be a ministry of war, of war against the Soviet Union, just as was its predecessor.


By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The banquet given by Mr. Henderson, the chairman of the II. International and Minister for Foreign Affairs to His British Majesty, to the honorary doctor of Oxford University and dictator of Egypt by the grace of Chamberlain, Mohammed Pacha Mahmoud, soon after the arrival of the latter in London, has had the expected political results. A few days after this social event, the official announcement was made that the Labour Government has entered into formal negotiations on the future fate of Egypt with the anti-constitutional and anti-democratic Mahmoud, the puppet of the Conservative government, of whom the Labour members declared only eleven months ago that without the British tanks near Cairo he would have long since floated down the Nile with his government; now these same Labour members enter into negotiations with this oppressor of the Egyptian people, on behalf of court and banking interests.
This is such a flagrant violation of every pledge given by the British Labour Party, such an open taking over of the reactionary Chamberlain traditions, that even the Wald Party, cautious as it is, and anxious to maintain an alliance with the Labour Party, has not been able to preserve silence. The organ of the Egyptian national bourgeoisie, although anything but revolutionary, has been forced by the total abandonment by the Labour Government of its own political line in the Egyptian question to make the following statement, which is extremely characteristic of the measures taken by the Labour Party to the avowal "a left wing" of national reformist elements in the colonies:

"If the English, whether Right or Left, keep Egypt under their yoke, this does not mean either great honour or great gain for them. It might, however, be expected that Mr. MacDonald, after proclaiming an era of justice and reason, of work in friendship for peace, would not, the very next day, make common cause with the imperialists against the defenceless peoples. On the part of the imperialists this is logical. From the standpoint of the workers it is betrayal. Principles and agreements alike are not scraps of paper. And the Conservatives will not fail, as soon as the opportunity arises, to demand immediately the recognition of the Labour guarantees, and ever and again fresh guarantees. The path chosen by Mr. MacDonald is strewn with dangers. If he were clearer sighted he would have built up his position on a more secure basis. Now he is the slave of his opponents, and if it is not possible he will be able to manoeuvre. They will force him, day by day, and at the cost of tremendous effort, to lay aside his halo. As a matter of fact the Conservatives are delighted at the Labour Party experiment, the Labour Party Cabinet being weak in its majority and through the character of its leaders. In this manner they have been able to achieve an aim of which they have never made a secret; that is, to let others carry out what they themselves consider necessary, but what they could not realise without breaking the inviolable principles of a traditional policy. It was a ticklish experiment. If it succeeded, they would have time enough to overthrow the Cabinet and prepare for their own return. If it did not succeed, the game was still theirs, and they could shatter the Labour Party."

("La Patrie", Cairo. 17th July 1929.)

Thus after only a few weeks of government Henderson had gone so far that he had lost a share of the Labour Party, and so far that the organ of the Egyptian bourgeoisie, on the question of adherence to principles. Therefore the greater the rejoicing on the part of the Mahmoud government, supported by the British bureaucratic apparatus in Egypt, for it has been able to see in the action of the Cabinet of the Labour Party a sanction of its dictatorship.

The Mahmoud government at once began to increase its pressure on its political opponents, again after relaxing this slightly for a few days after the victory of the Labour Party. Again newspapers were prohibited, domiciliary visits made (among these the house of Zaghlul Pasha's widow was searched), meetings dissolved. In order to prevent the possibility of a really revolutionary outbreak, although this was scarcely likely on the part of the Wald Party, the Ministry for Affairs hastened to draw up a special draft of an emergency law threatening with heavy sentences of penal servitude anyone making communist propaganda. The negotiations between Great Britain and Egypt were to be commenced on the basis of the previously rejected Chamberlain Sarwat Pasha agreement, tantamount to the complete capitulation of Egypt to British demands.

But now the pressure from the opposite side began. The Waldists mobilised — not the masses of the people, whom they fear like the plague — but at least all available telegraph wires, in order to proclaim to the world their protest against the "treachery of the government of the Labour Party. Besides this they uttered the warning that it would be better not to force them to extremes, since the discontent among the population had actually reached a very high pitch... In Great Britain itself Henderson's cordial welcome to Mohammed Mahmoud was too much for the adherents of the Independent Labour Party, and even some of the Liberal papers, the "Manchester Guardian" for instance, commented on the Egyptian question in a manner disagreeable for Henderson. Above all, the adherents of the Labour Party find themselves obliged to ask what it may mean when an agreement is concluded with a person who is merely the tool of the British Conservative Party.

The result has been that in the Egyptian question, as in the question of relations with the Soviet Union, in the disarmament question, and in the mining question, certain wavering may be observed in the course of the Labour Party, which has theretofore been sailing consistently in the Conservative way. A sacrifice must be made to the angry gods of public opinion. In Egyptian politics the sacrificial lamb has been Lord Lloyd.

It is true that the retention of Lord Lloyd as British High Commissioner in Egypt would have imposed an intolerable burden on a MacDonald Cabinet. Lord Lloyd of Dolobran has not pursued a moderately Conservative policy in Egypt, but an expressly Diehard policy; he is an unbridled imperialist of the old school, unable to appear as anything else either in word or deed; he has always ridden roughshod over Egyptian nationalism, and has behaved in Egypt, which is at least formally "independent", as if it were one of the crown colonies of Great Britain. Hence it would scarcely have been possible for Lord Lloyd to remain in office in any case, and Henderson secured the compromise conclusion with the aim of being able to dismiss him at precisely the moment public opinion in Great Britain and Egypt was protesting indignantly against the negotiations with Mohammed Mahmoud.

It would, however, be an error to assume that this "symbolic gesture" actually signifies Henderson's intention to deviate from the imperialist line in Egypt. It can mean either a be the more safely concluded (Lloyd the man being dropped "covered under which a pact with Mohammed Mahmoud may no system maintained), or it can be the prelude of an alliance between the Labour government and the Wald, whose extreme nationalism and parliamentary enthusiasm are at bottom nothing more nor less than an attempt to come to a compromise with the British bourgeoisie, even at the expense of the Egyptian people.

So long as the government of the British Labour Party does not do away with the British occupation of Egypt; does not annul the capitulation privileges, and does not secure full and legal development for the proletarian class organisations in Egypt, no "gestures" or explanations will make its policy otherwise than imperialist, a policy which is in principle a continuation of Chamberlain's policy, protecting solely the interests of British capital and betraying the interests of the working classes of Egypt and Great Britain.

The Fight for Land in Palestine.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

As a result of the methods of imperialist rule, a unique, hard and bitter struggle — the fight for land — has become the most immediate, in fact the central problem of political and economic life in Palestine. In order to convert Palestine into a favourable strategic basis for its war adventures, into a favourable strategic key position for conquering the whole of the Arab East, British imperialism has adopted the policy of a "Jewish National Home". This Jewish national home must, however, if British policy is to achieve its aim, be "built" in fierce and lasting conflict with the Arab masses, in the first place with the peasant masses. The British imperialists have, therefore, give their servants the Zionists to understand, that if a Jewish colonisation is to be tolerated at all, then it must proceed along agricultural lines.

Thus the Zionists have been given the hint to place once again in the foreground the expropriation campaign against the Arab peasants, which ever since the inception of Zionism has constituted the foundation of this "idealistic" movement. But in expropriating the Arab peasants recourse must not be had
This is such a flagrant violation of every pledge given by the British Labour Party, such an open taking over of the reactionary Chamberlain traditions, that even the Wald Party, cautious as it is, and anxious to maintain its alliance with the Labour Party, has not been able to preserve silence. The organ of the Egyptian national bourgeoisie, although anything but revolutionary, has been forced by the total abandonment by the Labour Government of its own political line in the Egyptian question to make the following statement, which is extremely characteristic of the shift towards the policy of the social reformists by even the most Right wing national reformist elements in the colonies:

“If the English, whether Right or Left, keep Egypt under their yoke, this does not mean either great honour or great gain for them. It might, however, be expected that Mr. MacDonald, after proclaiming an era of justice and reason, of work in friendship for peace, would not, the very next day, make common cause with the imperialists against the defenceless peoples. On the part of the imperialists this is logical. From the standpoint of the workers it is betrayal. Principles and agreements alike are not scraps of paper. And the Conservatives will not fail, as soon as problems of a more European character arise, to demand immediately the collapse of the Labour guarantees, and ever and again fresh guarantees. The path chosen by Mr. MacDonald is strewn with dangers. If he were clearer sighted he would have built up his position on a more secure basis. Now he is the slave of his opponents, and if it were not for so to speak the right will be able to manoeuvre. They will force him, day by day and through threats, to lay aside his hands.

As a matter of fact the Conservatives are delighted at the Labour Party experiment, the Labour Party Cabinet being weak in its majority and through the character of its leaders. In this manner they have been able to achieve an aim of which they have never made a secret: that is, to let others carry out what they themselves consider necessary, but what they could not realise without breaking the inviolable principles of a traditional policy. It was a ticklish experiment. If it succeeded, they would have time enough to overthrow the Cabinet and prepare for their own return. If it did not succeed, the game was still theirs, and they could shatter the Labour Party.”

("La Patrie", Cairo. 17th July 1929.)

Thus after only a few weeks of government Henderson had gone so far that he had to listen to the Labour organ of the Egyptian bourgeoisie, on the subject of adherence to principles. Therefore the greater the rejoicing on the part of the Mahmoud government, supported by the British bureaucratic apparatus in Egypt, for it has been able to see in the action of the Cabinet of the Labour Party a sanction of its dictatorship.

The Mahmoud government at once began to increase its pressure on its political opponents again, after relaxing it slightly for a few days after the victory of the Labour Party. Again newspapers were prohibited, domiciliary visits made (among these the house of Zaghlul Pasha's widow was searched), meetings dissolved. In order to prevent the possibility of a really revolutionary outbreak, although this was scarcely likely on the part of the Labour Party, the Ministry for Affairs hastened to draw up a special draft of an emergency law threatening with heavy sentences of penal servitude anyone making communist propaganda. The negotiations between Great Britain and Egypt were to be commenced on the basis of the previously rejected Chamberlain Sarwat Pasha agreement, tantamount to the complete capitulation of Egypt to British demands.

But now the pressure from the opposite side began. The Waldists mobilised not the masses of the people, whom they fear like the plague—but at least all available telegraph wires, in order to proclaim to the world their protest against the “treachery of the government of the Labour Party. Besides this they uttered the warning that it would be better not to force them to extremes, since the discontent among the population had actually reached a very high pitch... In Great Britain itself Henderson's cordial welcome to Mohammed Mahmoud was too much for the adherents of the Independent Labour Party, and even some of the Liberal papers, the “Manchester Guardian” for instance, commented on the Egyptian question in a manner disagreeable for Henderson. Above all, the adherents of the Labour Party find themselves obliged to ask what it may mean when an agreement is concluded with a person who is merely the tool of the British Conservative Party.

The result has been that in the Egyptian question, as in the question of relations with the Soviet Union, in the disarmament question, and in the mining question, certain wavering may be observed in the course of the Labour Party ship, which has hitherto been sailing consistently in the Conservative wake. A sacrifice must be made to the angry gods of public opinion. In Egyptian politics the sacrificial lamb has been Lord Lloyd.

It is true that the retention of Lord Lloyd as British High Commissioner in Egypt would have imposed an intolerable burden on a MacDonald Cabinet. Lord Lloyd of Dolobran has not pursued a moderately Conservative policy in Egypt, but an expressly Diehard policy; he is an unabrid ged imperialist of the old school, unable to appear as anything else either in word or deed; he has always ridden rough shod over Egyptian nationalism, and has behaved in Egypt, which is at least formally “independent”, as if it were one of the crown colonies of Great Britain. Hence it would scarcely have been possible for Lord Lloyd to remain in office in any case, and Henderson sensibly chose the convenient moment to dispose of him at precisely the moment public opinion in Great Britain and Egypt was protesting indignantly against the negotiations with Mohammed Mahmoud.

It would, however, be an error to assume that this “symbolic gesture” actually signifies Henderson's intention to deviate from the imperialist line in Egypt. It can mean either a be the more safely concluded (Lloyd the man being dropped “cover” under which a pact with Mohammed Mahmoud may but his system maintained), or it can be the prelude of an alliance between the Labour government and the White, whose extreme nationalism and parliamentary enthusiasm are at bottom nothing more nor less than an attempt to come to a compromise with the British bourgeoisie, even at the expense of the Egyptian people.

So long as the government of the British Labour Party does not do away with the British occupation of Egypt; does not annul the capitulation privileges, and does not secure full free and legal development for the proletarian class organisations in Egypt, no “gestures” or explanations will make its policy otherwise than imperialist, a policy which is in principle a continuation of Chamberlain's policy, protecting solely the interests of British capital and betraying the interests of the working classes of Egypt and Great Britain.

The Fight for Land in Palestine.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

As a result of the methods of imperialist rule, a unique, hard and bitter struggle—the fight for land—has become the most immediate, in fact the central problem of political and economic life in Palestine. In order to convert Palestine into a favourable strategic basis for its war adventures, into a favourable strategic key position for conquering the whole of the Arab world in the last instance, British imperial policy requires the aid of a “Jewish National Home”. This Jewish national home must, however, if British policy is to achieve its aim, be “built” in fierce and lasting conflict with the Arabian masses, in the first place with the peasant masses. The British imperialists have, therefore, given their servants the Zionists to understand, that if Jewish colonisation is to be tolerated at all, then it must proceed along agricultural lines.

Thus the Zionists have been given the hint to place once again in the foreground the expropriation campaign against the Arab peasants, which ever since the inception of Zionism has constituted the foundation of this “idealistic” movement. But in expropriating the Arab peasants recourse must not be had