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THE AUDIENCE
A NY meeting in the Albert Hall arrests attention.
No one is likely to go to the expense of en-
gaging that great building, or to the labour
of taking steps to fill it with ten thousand
people, except for a cause they consider
worthy of such effort. Judgments on what is worthy may
reasonably differ. There are plenty of marginal cases.
But there was nothing marginal about the Albert Hall
meeting of July 11, 1931. The purpose of the meeting—
the advocacy of a reduction and limitation of armaments
by international agreement—commanded universal support,
and the presence on the platform of the greatest living
British soldier, as Lord Cecil called Sir William Robertson,
in the Chair, the Prime Minister as mover of the resolution,
and the only two other living Prime Ministers—all three
of different parties—to support it, was more than enough
to account for the thousands that chose to pack the Albert
Hall on the afternoon of a brilliant summer Saturday
rather than devote themselves to various recreations
appropriate to such a day and such a time.

I
The weather, incidentally, meant much to the Disarmament demonstration, for outside the Hall crowds far larger than that within stood listening to the unseen orators' words, relied by the still astonishing resource of modern science to loud-speakers in Kensington Gardens and in the open space behind the Hall itself. Three hours before the meeting opened a little army had been gathering on the Embankment, to march with bands and banners through the heart of London to the Albert Hall, those armed with tickets to take their numbered places, and those without to join the patient but enthusiastic concourse round the loud-speakers in the open-air. But even that accounted for only a fraction of the listeners whose ears the speeches of the three party leaders reached, for throughout the United Kingdom, from Aberdeen to Falmouth, from Cromer to Carmarthen, crowds indoors and out had gathered in halls and schoolrooms and on village greens, like the crowds in the Albert Hall itself and Kensington Gardens opposite, to add their total to the vastest throng ever addressed on the most vital problem at present facing the statesmen of the world. More, indeed, might be said than that. No statistics are forthcoming, and none ever will be, but it may well be doubted if publicity so extensive has ever been organised for any meeting organised on British soil. And to the United States and other countries far beyond the confines of Britain the words were likewise carried.

No wonder speaker after speaker, beginning with Sir William Robertson, described the meeting as unique. Distinguished figures in politics, in the services (including notably British Legion leaders), in letters and in every walk of life, were there in plenty, but their names need not be singled out, for it was essentially a common people's gathering and no one would have desired to distinguish on such a day between great and small. All the more is that true if the occupants of the Albert Hall on that summer Saturday are counted, as they should be, as no more than a chance ten thousand among thousands of other ten thousands in this land and others, earnest equally in purpose to rid themselves of the burden and the peril of armaments if only their chosen leaders can find the practical way. To that question the chosen leaders of the people of Britain applied themselves in their speeches.
FIELD-MARSHAL SIR WILLIAM ROBERTSON

Sir William Robertson, as befits a soldier-chairman, was brief but forcible. He spoke at once of the World Disarmament Conference. We hoped for success, but certain nations were not prepared to accept limitation even at the present level. We alone, claimed the Field-Marshal, quoting from a recent speech by the Prime Minister, had so far taken a genuine step in the direction of reduction. But more steps must be taken everywhere. Germany, said Sir William, amid applause, was told at Versailles that measures for all round disarmament would follow, but they have not followed. She cannot be expected to tolerate that humiliating position for ever. Then there was Russia. That great country, said the Chairman, was spoken of as a great obstacle to disarmament—but, he was careful to add, without sufficient reason, I think myself.

There were other impediments that need not be enumerated, impediments that made some people declare disarmament neither desirable nor feasible.

I do not want, said Sir William Robertson, to think that, because we all remember what the last war cost us, and the next war, if there is one, will probably cost a great deal more.

Ten million lives were lost to the world in the last war, and they say that seventy or eighty million pounds in money were spent in the preliminary bombardment in the Battle of Ypres; before any infantry left their trenches the sum of twenty-two million pounds was spent, and the weight of ammunition fired in the first few weeks of that battle amounted to 480 thousand tons.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not believe that that represents the best use the world can be expected to make of its brains and its resources. (Applause.) I prefer to believe that the majority of people in the world in these days think that war hurts everybody, benefits nobody—except the profiteers—and settles nothing. (Applause.)

In a closing passage, punctuated by repeated applause, Sir William struck a note to which the meeting responded with the assent of deep desire.

Great Britain, he said, has in the past taken a prominent place in the councils of the world; she took a prominent part in the war, and the time has arrived, I suggest, when she can take a prominent part again. (Applause.) It is most gratifying to find that on this
matter of disarmament, as we call it, all three parties in this country are working in combination. (Applause.)

It only remains to assure the Government of the Day—never mind what Government—when the Conference comes that it has behind it the whole-hearted support of the men and women of this country. (Applause.)

As one who has passed pretty well half a century in the study and practice of war, I suggest to you that you should give that support and so do your best to ensure the promotion of peace. (Applause.)

And then—I now call on the Prime Minister.

THE RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was in indifferent health. For a day or two before the meeting he had kept indoors, and then gone to Chequers for an interval of relative quiet to prepare for new activities, of which his speech at the Albert Hall was the first. Rising, grey-suited, with the full fierceness of the arc-lights installed for the cinema-men concentrated on him, Mr. MacDonald, when the long applause that greeted him died down, picked up in his first minute the idea Sir William Robertson had voiced in his last—Great Britain must lead.

A word on the unity the meeting represented—To-day we are a united nation. None are for the party; all are for the State—and then to next February's Conference and its attempt to reduce armaments substantially by mutual agreement.

This meeting, declared the Prime Minister, has been gathered together, representative of every party in the nation, representative of every creed and religion in the nation, representative of every school of culture in the nation, to bid the representatives who will go from here to be of good courage and to have a far-seeing wisdom during that Conference, and to do, what Sir William Robertson suggested we could so properly do,
once again to let this country take a lead in the cause of Peace. (Loud applause.)

From this point the Prime Minister’s words must be given in full. Let us, he urged, have no illusions about disarmament. The Chairman said that the goal is not going to be reached in one day, or in one march. We must be persistent. We must be faithful. But we must also be patient. Disarmament is essentially an International question. Alone, a nation can pioneer, but alone, a nation cannot attain. Peace will only come upon this earth when the nations of the world have assembled together and agreed together. One nation can challenge, can set an example, can strike shame in other nations, but it alone can never create that state of disarmament which, it is our conviction, is essential to the condition of Peace. (Applause.)

One great nation seeking its own security by arms may not only thwart all others pursuing peace, but may be able to drag them down and down and down against their own will through the inevitable destruction of another war.

People seeking safety by arms are like people seeking shelter under trees during a thunderstorm; they are at the very point which is first struck when the thunderstorm breaks, instead of being secure during grievous danger.

History is one unbroken story of armed peoples attacking armed peoples. Often after a war a defeated State says: ‘Ah! if we had only been prepared enough,’ and, as the defeated State says that, the conquering State says: ‘Ah! and now we must be careful lest by slackness we lose the opportunity which we now have. We must be prepared enough again.’ The poison is that ‘enough.’ When peoples begin to think of that ‘enough’ they begin to catalogue the possibilities of mobilisation, and every man, woman and child is counted; every single factory that may produce armaments is catalogued; every possibility of turning weapons of inoffensiveness into weapons of offence is prepared; secret books are compiled and laid aside for a day. When people get into that mentality what happens? War is bound to happen because it has become so much part and parcel of the unconsidered axiomatic conduct of people that it is bound in an unguarded moment to break out into reality. (Applause.) Science increases in its power as invention becomes more and more perfect. The range of Nature’s mysteries which man can command widens and widens, and becomes
more and more important. Then the weapons that are available for destruction become more and more potent, and, in the course of time, the struggle which used to be between armies led by men like our Chairman, armies in uniforms, armies which on both sides have laid themselves open to the possibility of death, that limited kind of war becomes a thing of the past, as it was in the last war, and at last every town, every village, and every populated area becomes a battle-field, and from the sea and the air alike dash the weapons of destruction, and there is no division drawn between combatants and non-combatants. The great Armageddon struggle must come at last, and the end of it will not be cheers of victory, but the silence of exhaustion. Mankind will be—I was going to say almost wiped out. Mankind is to be exhausted, and all his works of civilisation annihilated. That is the fear that faces the people who say we are going to trust for our national security to the accumulation of armaments. We are to strive—and this meeting is gathered here for the purpose of demonstrating our determination to strive against the final chapter ever being written.

Security rests not in armaments, but in preventing the causes, which have hitherto created

war, developing into actual outbreaks of war. (Applause.)

There are still some people who say that disarmament is bad; and those people pose as people of special honour; they seem to arrogate to themselves a greater sense or a greater sensibility as nationalists than those common people, like ourselves, who are in favour of Peace. Do those people know that this nation's honour is deeply pledged to disarmament? Disarmament is not a delusion of a coterie. Disarmament is an ideal that this country has pledged itself again and again and again to put before it in all its international relations. (Applause.) I am under the impression—if I am wrong Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Lloyd George will correct me—that we signed as a nation Article VIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations. I am under the impression that we signed the Preamble to Part V of the Treaty of Versailles. I think I am right in that. I am under the impression that we also signed everything, all the expressions of opinions and intentions that were embodied in the Treaty of Locarno. Mr. Baldwin knows about that. That is my impression. I am also under the impression that at the very moment it was signed, when we were face to face with the Germans,
come there to meet us and sign that treaty, the Chairman of the Allies during the negotiations gave in writing a document which ought to be pasted on every hoarding in this country, and which ought to be emblazoned in front of every delegate who attends the Conference next February in Geneva, saying that the Allies were not imposing this measure of disarmament upon Germany simply because Europe was afraid of German military ambitions—no, not that only, but this document, which every man and woman of our country is bound personally to see carried out, also said: We are imposing this disarmament upon Germany as a first step towards the reduction and limitation of armaments which we seek to bring about—that is the Allies, that is us, as one of the most fruitful preventative of war, and which it will be one of the first duties of the League of Nations to promote. As a good citizen, I want to take upon myself the duties which have been imposed upon me by those who represented me at such Conferences as that at Versailles. To those who think that a path can be found by treading the ways of destruction, I say that honour binds them and us to use all our powers to show that Great Britain and its Dominions are among those who not only preach peace, but ensure it and seek to establish it by a democratic policy. *(Applause.)*

It is very curious that, after all these things have been said, after all these things have been done, there is more money spent in Europe to-day on armaments than has ever been spent, not only in Europe, but on the American continent as well. More money is spent on armaments now than has been spent during any past period of peace. The sentiment of peace is universal, but the practice of peace is circumscribed. How is that sentiment to be translated into a programme? I venture to say that there is not a single delegate who will go to Geneva in February who will not preach peace, not one who will say that the sentiments of peace are wrong. There is not one who will not utter those opinions with the utmost eloquence and conviction. But as soon as they begin to work in their sub-committees the difficulties of securing international disarmament will appear.

I say this: let us proclaim from here that sentiment and piety are not enough now. As a matter of fact, there may be impediments in the way of the practical work that is required in the reduction of armaments, and the world expects from Geneva not merely resolutions saying that we are all in favour of peace but a reduction in figures, in tonnages, in man power, in material, an actual reduction in those materials which mean that
the nations are preparing for war. Unless we reduce
men, unless we reduce guns, unless we reduce ships,
unless we reduce the means for destruction from the
air, unless we reduce all weapons wrought for the
purpose of destruction, unless we can produce pro-
grammes with figures for armaments which are less
than the figures of the various nations now, we shall
not have done our duty at Geneva.

We are going to go to Geneva determined by
persuasion, by arguments, by appeals to what has
been written, appeals to measures already taken,
appeals to history, appeals to common sense, to
get the nations of the world to join in and reduce
this enormous disgraceful burden of armaments
which we are now bearing from one end of the
world to the other. (Applause.)

The point of it all is this: Geneva must give results.
The way is going to be difficult; it is going to be long.
I have had a little experience of it. When you settle
down to tonnages, to man-power, to the class of man
you are going to count, to such questions as who is
going to be regarded as a man under arms, what kind of
material is going to be taken into account, and so on, it is
difficult. Take submarines: are they weapons of offence
or are they weapons of defence? Take the development
of air power. Is it to be legitimate in future that nations
should arm themselves with instruments and implements
the sole purpose of which is to drop bombs on civil
populations? Innumerable questions have to be
examined, and those who are going to take part in this
work will need your patience and your support. The
way will be long; the way will be hard. We may hardly
get to the first step towards what we want. Yes, my
friends, but do not hang your heads and sit down by the
wayside and die because Heaven has not been gained at
the first assault. Not at all. The man we want to-day to
tackle these conflicting problems that we have to face is the
man—and the woman—that can come right up to the
assault, be beaten back and yet come back again. It is in
that way that by the faith, the persistence, the energy
and the endurance of the human heart that which we
regard as precious, that which we regard as true, that
which we regard as essential to the Divine purpose in
creation, is bound by patience, by energy and by faith
to be carried to triumphant issues in the course of world
affairs.

The Prime Minister sat down amid sustained applause
which broke out again in ample volume as the Chairman
called on Mr. Stanley Baldwin.
THE RT. HON. STANLEY BALDWIN

The Conservative leader waited for the cheers to fade, squared his shoulders to the microphone, and was stopped immediately by more applause as he referred in his opening sentence to that great speech from the Prime Minister, and played for a moment on the unity not merely of three party leaders but of Englishman, Celt and Cymri. Then he struck the note his predecessor had sounded before him. We are bound, he declared, to the accompaniment of more cheers yet, by treaty and by honour to international disarmament. Now, that requires no eloquent words from an Englishman. He merely says he accepts it, and then he does his best. I want you to consider with me for a few minutes one aspect of this question which is very apt to be overlooked.

If you cast your minds back to Armistice Day, as was done by one of the previous speakers, and you recall the temper of the nation at that time, what is it that stands out? It is the spirit in which we met the Peace. It could not have been better illustrated than in a very short story which I may tell you. The first man I met that day in the House of Commons was an old friend of many of us, Will Crooks, who, taking both my hands in that large right hand of his, just looked at me as though he was going to ask a question. I said to him, 'Well, Will, I feel more like crying to-day than cheering,' and the tears came into his eyes as he said, 'I have had my cry.' Well, now, that was characteristic of Will Crooks, and it was characteristic of a great many people of that day. There was born at that time the resolution that so far as we as a people could manage it in this mundane world we were going to fight against war. (Applause.) I think that this meeting, representative of so many who are working for the cause of disarmament, and representative of many who, perhaps, would like to move further and quicker than I might think possible at the moment, can surely congratulate itself upon that will which came over the nation at that time and which has shown no signs of subsiding since—that resolution which has been shown, not as some people would show it, in words, but in deeds and in acts, but with so little advertisement that many people in this country do not realise what our contribution has been to world disarmament.

It is well that we should dwell on it, if only for a moment, not for any self-adulation or glorification, but to show that the principles for which you are fighting are principles that are accepted among our own people in all parties, and that, again, we have already been carried
PREHISTORIC ANCESTOR
"What do you think of this craze for trying to walk upright?"

ALLEGED REALIST
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MODERN CITIZEN
"What do you think of this push for disarmament?"

ALLEGED REALIST
"Just nonsense. It isn't natural. We've always made wars and we always will."
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farther along the road which you desire than twelve years ago could have been thought possible.

Mr. Baldwin proceeded to quote a series of significant figures illustrating the reduction of British armaments since the War—naval personnel down from 151,000 in 1914 to 100,000 in 1924 and nearly 6,000 lower still in 1931; the 3,300 aeroplanes in commission at the Armistice cut down to 300, and the increased programme adopted subsequently in consequence of the failure of other countries to reduce still standing by common assent between all parties 25 per cent. short of fulfilment.

Such a situation, the late Prime Minister asserted, cannot continue indefinitely, and there is nothing more urgently wanted at this Conference than to press for reductions in the air forces of the world, an attempt to bring about some form of parity in the air forces of Western Europe, as I regard the air force as the spearhead of invasion, and probably the most dangerous form of arm against peace which exists in the world to-day. (Applause.)

Now that, Mr. Baldwin declared, has been a one-sided disarmament. As the Prime Minister said quite truly, the will to peace exists. I think he said, throughout Europe among the statesmen. The will to peace—but they have not all got the same, shall we say, conviction that we have that the cause of peace is going to be aided by international disarmament. That is the belief that we have got to try to help to spread among the nations of the world. It can be done by the meeting of statesmen, it can be done through the League of Nations. And I would pause here for a moment to say, as I said in the House of Commons the other day, that our hope in Europe is in the League of Nations. (Applause.)

It is only through that intimate relationship of the statesmen of the countries of Europe that you can bring to bear what the Prime Minister spoke of: the argument, the persuasion, the friendly pressure, that can be brought by men constantly meeting, and by men deep and true in conviction.

The difficulties, as the Prime Minister said, are great. The questions of armies and reserves and conscription are most difficult questions to which they will have to give their minds. But there are some difficulties, great difficulties, which I hope before too long may be remedied.
The League of Nations suffers from the absence of two nations, one in the East and one in the West, who are necessary to it before it can accomplish the work that it ought to accomplish. I mean Russia and the United States of America. (Applause.) I rejoice to think that both those nations will be represented at the Disarmament Conference.

The negotiations with Russia must necessarily be difficult from the nature of the case itself; but until we can see in that country progressive disarmament, you can never get rid of the fear that exists in Eastern Europe against so great and so powerful a neighbour. And, while it is not for us either to ask, or to advise, or to try to cajole—the least successful of all—the United States of America to get them to come into the League of Nations, yet I do say this without fear of contradiction from any statesman who has had to deal with international problems in Europe: that every international problem in Europe since the Treaty of Versailles has been made incomparably more difficult to Europeans by the absence of America from the League of Nations.

I want to point out to you just one little difficulty—you are as familiar with these questions as I am. Article XVI of the Covenant was drawn up in the full belief that America would be a member of the League of Nations. (Hear, hear.) The economic sanction is by far the most powerful sanction in the world against war, if properly applied. Economic sanctions can stop war, if properly applied. We may be obliged some day to apply an economic sanction. The economic sanction we can apply is blockade. Does anyone know what the action of the United States of America would be in the event of a blockade in Europe? No one. It is our ignorance on that question, our fear of what blockade would mean with America not a member of the League of Nations, that casts doubt and throws difficulty in relation to one of the most important Articles in the Covenant of the League.

There is a host of reasons why we want America to be a member of the League of Nations, and there is this reason in particular: we want her help in these appalling problems of reconciling national interests and disarmament. (Applause.)

The Prime Minister said one wise word among many. (Applause.) There is one word which is much
more often on the lips of Englishmen than on the lips of the Celt: patience. After all, ultimately and fundamentally the fight for peace is a spiritual fight. ('Hear, hear,' and applause.) We have to deal with things of the world. Those fights, as the Prime Minister said, are not won in a moment, but this fight will be won ultimately. What we have got to see to is that we keep moving, that we never look back, that we never go back, that we admit no check, that we hang on the faith to those who come after us, and in the long run we shall win and win out. It may well be that in years to come our posterity may recognise that we did with a brave heart and with faith all that it was possible for us to do in these most difficult, critical and troublous times.

Again the applause that greeted the speaker's peroration was interrupted only for a moment till it broke out again to greet his successor's rising.

THE RT. HON. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

That successor was Mr. Lloyd George and the meeting obviously looked forward to his eloquence with lively anticipation. The Liberal leader was soon driving home his points characteristically. Unity regarding disarmament? he asked. Certainly. Always unity everywhere—in word. You can get a meeting of all parties voting for the same identical resolution in any part of Great Britain, on the Continent of Europe and in any continent of the world. But it is also one of the dangers of the position, because disarmament is one of those questions where everybody agrees in principle and differs in practice. It is just like one of those Bills which are the most difficult to pilot through the House of Commons—a Bill that gets a second reading without a division, but when you get into Committee you find that no two persons agree upon any section or sub-section of the Bill. What it really means is that no one wants the Bill—or at least very few want it—but no one dare say so.

I am afraid it is very much the same with regard to the policy of disarmament in the world. In order to get results on any question you must first of all face realities. Some of these have been put before you by the Prime Minister in his eloquent appeal, and I shall only just dot the i's of what he said.
Take the Covenant of the League of Nations. Lord Cecil and I had the honour of collaborating in carrying that through. (Applause.) I went to the length of proposing the first resolution at the Peace Conference in 1919 upon the basis of which the Covenant was framed, and Lord Robert Cecil (as he then was) worked it out in that great Committee presided over by President Wilson. By that Covenant, as the Prime Minister has pointed out to you, there is an undertaking on the part of all the signatories to that Treaty to reduce armaments to the lowest minimum compatible with security, and security is made greater by the establishment of the League of Nations.

What has happened? Every nation—and there were over 30 there, great and small—signed it, and signed it with alacrity. Did they mean it? Perhaps they did; perhaps they did not. All I know is, it has not been done. Have they tried? Mr. Stanley Baldwin has pointed out that to a very considerable extent we have carried out our undertakings. We abolished conscription right away. We reduced our land forces, and, as one of the greatest Maritime Powers in the world, both at the Washington Conference and the London Conference we did our best to reduce naval armaments.

That has been a good beginning. But take the land forces and the air forces of the world. Some of the Powers, after signing that Covenant and after authorising M. Clemenceau to make that famous declaration—it was not his; he did it at the request of the Allied and Associated Powers and gave that solemn pledge—some of the Powers as soon as they got home forthwith started to build up new armies, great armies. They taxed themselves and borrowed from others to equip those armies, and almost all nations have been engaged ever since in increasing and perfecting and strengthening their armaments. They have kept Germany to her promise, but they have broken their own.

Then, continued Mr. Lloyd George, confusing slightly the Disarmament Commission, which has in fact hatched a Disarmament Convention and the coming Disarmament Conference, with the coming Conference itself, we had a Disarmament Commission. It has been sitting for years—and so far hatched nothing. (Laughter.) It is not yet decided when and how to begin. It will do so next year, I think, because it is very fortunate in having an excellent Chairman in Mr. Arthur Henderson. (Loud applause.) Then you had Locarno, with peace and security and arbitration, which was to be followed by disarmament, and the joy bells were ringing, and there were banquets at Locarno, and Paris, and London, to celebrate the new era. The Angel of
Peace has never been so toasted before. (Laughter.) But since then preparations for war have been going on in almost every country throughout the world who signed that Treaty, and at an accelerated pace, so that somebody said, 'You must have another idea. You must have a Pact to renounce war altogether.' That was proposed by a country whose armaments were much more powerful than they were before the War, and whose armaments have increased since they signed the Pact to renounce war. Sixty other countries signed. They had, all of them, great armies, and since they signed the Pact to renounce war the armies had become greater and more powerful.

They all renounced war, but they forgot to renounce the preparations for war. (Applause.)

It is just like a man who takes the pledge, and then proceeds immediately to fill his cellar with the choicest wines and the most potent spirits which he can purchase in the market.

It is only twelve years ago since peace was made. Ten millions of young men were slaughtered, and many millions more mutilated. I think that the Chairman said that it cost 60 or 70 thousand million pounds. In this country our taxation is the heaviest in the world. One reason is because we pay our debts. (Applause.) Our Income Tax is heaviest; our Super Tax is heaviest; our Death Duties are the heaviest; I believe that our duties on beer, spirits and tobacco are the heaviest in the world. We raise a gigantic sum of over five hundred million from these sources; something beyond the dreams and indeed the nightmares of tax payers and tax gatherers before the war. Where do those five hundred million pounds go? I will tell you. Every penny goes to pay and to liquidate the cost of past wars, and to pay one hundred million pounds to prepare for future wars. Here armaments are going on. Half of the cost of unemployment is due to the war. The nations of the world are now spending over 800 millions, when they are tottering on the brink of bankruptcy, to prepare for war. There are the debts of war and the devastation of war.

Let us be quite frank. The only lessons of the war to which practical effect is given to-day are the military lessons of the war. Military defects are studied, as the Prime Minister pointed out, and steps are immediately taken to remedy them for the next war. The weapons of war are studied, and stronger weapons, more powerful and more destructive, are being devised and invented and manufactured. The bombers were insufficient in the last war and not terrible enough; so their numbers are multiplied, and their destructive effect is intensified.
Poison more deadly than any ever devised before has now been considered and manufactured. What for? — the next war. In the last war you had horrible carnage. The next is inconceivable, and yet the world is going on steadily, stolidly, stupidly, marching towards that catastrophe, singing the songs of peace and preparing for war.

At this moment everybody who has returned from the Continent of Europe tells me this, that one of the commonplaces of conversation there is 'Next war'—those two words. 'Who will be on our side?'—and the real lessons of war not yet learned.

I want to say one word before I conclude, said Mr. Lloyd George with a glance at his watch.

You will never disarm, you will never get real disarmament until you renounce war not merely on a scroll of paper but in the hearts of men. (Applause.)

If you have a dispute or difference with your neighbour, you do not buy muskets to shoot him down, you do not stock your cellars with bombs to blow up his house and his family, or gas cylinders to poison them. Civilisation has eliminated all these savage possibilities in civil strife. Incendiarism, mutilation, murder, as a means of arranging a quarrel, are not tolerated and are regarded as crimes. They are crimes for an individual; they are crimes for groups of individuals, however powerful they may be: companies, trusts, federations, unions; it is a crime for any of them to try to settle their differences by means of that kind. But the moment the group becomes a nation, whose business it is to promote good conduct and encourage it, the crime becomes an instrument of public policy.

You will not succeed until you break down the distinction in the minds of mankind between the principles that guide individuals and those which ought to guide nations in these matters.

The applause that greeted that declaration, echo of the cheers that had greeted Mr. Baldwin's reference to the fight for disarmament as a spiritual struggle, showed the temper of the meeting, and the speaker's closing words made a deep appeal.

Let us, he urged, take every step, let us make every effort to teach and influence the minds of men in that direction. When that is done, the Pact to renounce war will become a reality; the League of Nations then will become the most potent human agency to save humanity from the horror and squalor of war; and, in the inspired words, we shall have peace as a river of righteousness, as the waves of the sea. (Applause.)
THE RESOLUTION

So the principal speeches ended. Amid acclamation the resolution:

That this meeting warmly welcomes the forthcoming Disarmament Conference and urges the Government to do all in its power to bring about a real reduction in the Armies, Navies and Air Forces of the World,

was put to the meeting and carried. Then Dr. Maude Royden and Lord Cecil, the latter given the tumultuous reception due most justly to the man who has laboured more earnestly and more effectively than any other living for the cause of disarmament, voiced the thanks of the audience to the statesmen who had come there thus publicly to pledge their faith.

DR. MAUDE ROYDEN

Miss Royden, a striking splash of crimson against the black-coated background, appealed for the liberation of the world not merely from war itself but from the eternal fear of war, which is hardly better. The Prime Minister had spoken of the need of patience. Miss Royden—her words evoked cheers from every corner of the hall—urged that there were moments when impatience was more necessary still. The forces making for war were impatient and the forces making for peace must at least keep pace with them.

Like almost every preceding speaker Dr. Royden emphasised the need for a British lead.

We all came on to this platform, she said, holding our programmes in the form of Union Jacks. We did well. The patriotism that would desire to add any further territories to our gigantic Empire would be the very madness of patriotism, but that patriotism which desires that our country shall lead the world in the cause of civilisation and peace is a patriotism of which no one should be ashamed.

It is in that sense that those of us who love our country best would echo the words of that great song which has been sung too often in another sense, but to-day surely means that to which all our leaders have been calling us this afternoon:

Wider yet, and wider, let her bounds be set,
God, who made her mighty, make her mightier yet.
I do not refer only to his economic proposals, but to the fact that he has never missed a chance of speaking with weighty and emphatic words in favour of the disarmament of the world. And now that advice has been in this great meeting endorsed by the leaders of our people. Do not tell me that success is doubtful under that leadership; with that support we cannot fail.

I agree very much with everything that is said about the difficulties of disarmament. The difficulties are great; but, believe me, if we are resolved, we assuredly can overcome them. If I understand the temper of this meeting aright, it is that they wish our delegates next February to tell the nations of the world that they now have a choice between blessing and cursing, between disarmament and self-destruction, between death and life, and that the British peoples here and throughout the Empire are determined to choose life.

Between now and next February, with this great meeting as a send-off, let us make it clear to the whole world—and especially to all those nations who value the friendship of Britain—what is the British policy, and, more than their policy, the British determination in this matter.
The vote of thanks is put by Lord Cecil himself and carried. The organ calls the audience to its feet as the first notes of the National Anthem frame themselves, and quickly through the multitudinous exits ten thousand people pour out into the sunlight to mingle with the other thousands on the Kensington Gardens' grass who have listened to the speeches borne aloud above the roar of the traffic streams pouring east and west between them and the Hall itself. The greatest Disarmament Demonstration in history is ended. But its end is only a beginning. Lord Cecil's with this great meeting as a send-off puts the meeting in its right relation with the future.

**WHY DISARM?**

Our Pledges: Great Britain has given a formal promise that, along with other nations, she will reduce and limit her armaments. Our Burden: The World is spending to-day on armaments upwards of £2,000,000 a day. Great Britain's share exceeds £200 a minute. We cannot afford it.

Our Peril: We cannot get security by increasing armaments, for neighbouring nations can follow suit. Competition leads to War.

**SHALL WE BE SAFE?**

Why not—if all countries join in the "all-round reduction and limitation of national armaments by international agreement" which we call "Disarmament"? We have the League of Nations, the World Court of Justice, the Locarno Treaties, the Briand-Kellogg Pact, the whole machinery for preventing war and settling international disputes by peaceful means. It works. It HAS worked. The habit of using it is growing. That way lies real safety.

**THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE** will meet on February 2nd, 1932. IT MUST SUCCEED. Why not an all-round reduction of armaments by 25 per cent., measured in money, within five years? It is perfectly possible and perfectly safe if the countries taking part in the conference care enough for their national honour to fulfil their treaty obligations. Against a united world, the strongest State would be powerless.

**JUSTICE** and prudence alike demand that the Conference of 1932 must begin to equalise the armaments of the "vanquished" and the "victorious" Powers—by scaling DOWN. Otherwise a new race in armaments will begin, and another war will be imminent. If the Conference is to succeed, the nations must show their Governments in time that they will support all reductions to which the Conference may agree. You can help if you will

**JOIN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION**

16 Grosvenor Crescent, London, S.W.I