

des fauteuils et du tableau noir.

Une autre surprise vous sera présentée demain au lunch de la part de la direction de Annin Banner en Amérique.

En tant qu'amateurs de Banistique et de tout ce qui s'y rapporte, nous aimons suivre le protocole. Ce que je voudrais vous proposer c'est d'envoyer au commencement de notre congrès une télégramme à Sa Majesté la Reine Juliana et Son Altesse Le Prince Bernhard, Prince des Pays-Bas, ainsi conçu :

Des spécialistes banistiques de 10 nationalités, de 7 pays et de 3 parties du monde, réunis pour la première fois au Congrès à Huidenberg, prient votre Majesté et votre Altesse Royale de bien vouloir agréer l'expression de leur plus grand respect.

Pour les congressistes

Kl. Sierkema

Au cas où vous seriez d'accord avec cette proposition, je vous prie de le vouloir manifester par un applaudissement. (Applaudissement cordial)

Et maintenant, mes chers amis, nous aimerions vous offrir l'occasion de faire plus ample connaissance pendant un simple repas que mes filles ont préparé pour nous.

Tout de suite après, nous nous mettrons au travail.

At hotel HET RECHTHUIS

13.30 p.m.

Dhr. Mr. J.H. Rombach, Alkmaar : RED CROSS FLAGS AND EMBLEMS

The red cross on a white ground is really a unique emblem. I am not talking about the Red Cross flag only because it cannot properly be set apart from the other applications of the emblem such as the armlet, the painted red cross on buildings or ships, etc. The red cross that we know nowadays as the emblem that stands for

humanity and the fight against suffering, has nothing to do with the red cross that was used as a knights symbol in a more chivalrous age or by the crusaders, although we will see that the remembrance of the crusaders can be made responsible for the broken unity in the emblem.

When in 1859 Henry Dunant wrote his famous pamphlet "A souvenir of Solferino" that became the catalysator of what we know as the Red Cross organisation, he did not mention an emblem for the volunteer corps which he had in mind. But the idea of voluntary aid on the battlefield took form and was widely supported in all distinguished circles throughout Europe, and in 1863 the so called Committee of Five, consisting of five influential citizens of Geneva, of which Dunant acted as a secretary, organised an international conference in Geneva.

At this purely private meeting the Red Cross and the emblem were born. During the discussions one of the members of the committee of five proposed that the volunteers should wear a white armband on the left upper arm, but this was not accepted and after some discussions one agreed on a white armband with a red cross on it as distinctive emblem for the voluntary aid personnel. So the red cross armband appeared in the proposals of the conference to the various governments that had to set the next step. Although the records of the meeting do not say so it is most probable that it has been general Dufour, the eminent Swiss commander, who finally proposed the red cross in addition to the white armband. He was the only officer in the Committee of Five; and from a military point of view the pure white armband or flag was not acceptable, for the white flag has from old times been used for parliamentaries and the white armband is often used by arbiters during military manoeuvres. Why the red cross? No records or other publications of that time give any clue to this question. It is possible that general Dufour had his own national flag in mind and just reversed it, but he nor anybody else ever ex-



14A

pressed the idea that the newly chosen emblem was the reverse of the Swiss flag.

One year later, in August 1864, an official diplomatic conference met in Geneva to discuss the proposals of the 1863 conference. One of the points raised was the emblem. This conference adopted the Geneva convention of August 22, 1864 for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies of the field. Article 7 of this document reads as follows: "A distinctive and uniform flag shall be adopted for hospitals, ambulances and evacuation parties. It shall in all circumstances be accompanied by the national flag. An armlet may also be worn by personnel enjoying neutrality but its issue shall be left to the military authorities. Both flag and armlet shall bear a red cross on a white ground". Here it is not the place to speak about the great importance and influence of this first Geneva convention in the development of international law, but I want to underline that as far as I know the then introduced emblem is still the only emblem that enjoys an acknowledged status in formal international law.

Unfortunately it has not been possible to maintain the red cross as the only emblem of the Geneva convention and of the organisation that was gradually taking shape and that derived its name from the emblem: the RED CROSS (capital letters). 1876 the unity was broken when Turkey introduced the red crescent as an emblem for its military medical service. This country has signed the convention without reservation but now in war with Russia it announced that the emblem of the red cross would hurt the feelings of the muslim soldiers and it would be replaced by the red crescent.

Here we may see a late remainder of the crusades. After some discussion Russia and Turkey agreed to respect their mutual emblems. So the unity was broken by a unilateral modification of a clause of the convention by one country. Of course the International Committee of the Red Cross, the former Committee of Five, and now the leading body of the Red Cross movement, was not at all happy with the new development and from that time it worked and is still working for the reunification of the emblem.

First of all it contested the religious meaning of the red cross. In 1870, so before the break, Gustave Moynier, president of the International Committee, had given three possible reasons why the red cross could have been chosen: 1st: as a reverse of the Swiss flag, 2nd as a remembrance of the cross at Golgotha (a bloody cross on a white shroud) and 3rd as an easily applicable sign. Moynier did not, however, at that time set great value on the question.

Then in 1882 he writes a new book and now he stresses the origin of the red cross from the Swiss flag, even suggesting that the delegates of 1863 had intentionally reversed the later one. This argument was not conform to reality and not so well founded too. The cross in the Swiss flag has really its origin in christianity if we go back as far as emperor Constantine who gave the crucifix as an emblem to the Holy Roman German Empire. Via the flag of the canton of Schwyz this cross of the empire came in the Swiss federal flag.

It is remarkable that Moynier did not stress the more obvious reason for adopting the cross, namely that it can be easily applied, always and everywhere. From archaeological research it is furthermore proved that the cross in all its forms is one of the oldest symbols used by men.

The International Committee did not succeed in convincing Turkey, and that country went still further by using the red crescent for the hospital ships, too. This matter came up at the Hague peace conference of 1899 which adopted the convention for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva convention of 1864.

At that occasion Siam and Persia demanded the right to use the red flame and the lion. From that time the ICRC earnestly tried to repair the broken unity. In 1906 the first convention was revised, on which occasion the theory about reversing the Swiss colours in honour of that country was formally adopted and incorporated in the convention itself. This was done intentionally in order to avoid any further argument about the religious meaning of the emblem.

Art. 18 says: "As a compliment to Switzerland the heraldic emblem of the red cross on a white ground, formed by reversing the federal colours, shall be retained as the emblem and distinctive sign of the army medical service". The aim has however not been reached, for Turkey signed under reservation of the use of the red crescent. Persia did not sign this convention at all. Siam signed without reservation and has since used the red cross. Egypt followed the Turkish example and so in 1929 the intervention of those two countries and Persia succeeded in getting the red crescent and the red lion and sun recognised as an official emblem of the convention, but only for the countries using them already. Putting it like this one hoped to avoid the introduction of other new emblems and the expansion of the use of the red crescent. This last hope came not true, for various Islamic countries have since adopted the red crescent and the ICRC has not thought it wise to oppose the recognition of the national societies of these countries. I must say here that the countries of the Far East, Japan and China and also Pakistan, which is all the same a pure Muslim state, have adopted the red cross! Only the near eastern countries and Algeria use the red crescent; in the Soviet Union as a federal republic both emblems are employed. The Russian red cross is formally the Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies of the USSR. The existence of three emblems in what for the sake of convenience is called the Red Cross world is always felt as a serious drawback and the suggestion for a solution of the problem are numerous. But the status quo has been maintained when the conventions were revised in 1949, be it only with a majority of one vote. The problem arose in all its severity when the new state of Israel proposed to include the red shield of David. This amendment was rejected with only 22 against 21 and 7 abstentions. It means that the national society of the Red Shield of David of Israel cannot be recognized as a member of the cross family. The flag and other emblems used by this society are not entitled to the protection of the convention. As Israel has signed and ratified the four conventions of 1949, it is however bound to respect the red cross and red crescent of the other par-

ties to these conventions, I think we may be quite content that in 1949 the door to new emblems was shut. One has suggested the adoption of a quite new emblem, but it is not too much to say that any renunciation of the old and worldwide-known red cross on a white ground would have put human lives in great danger. Regarding this history of the emblem itself I would like to mention one point that will be of interest to you. The article I quoted from the convention of 1906 speaks of the heraldic emblem of the red cross. This word "heraldic" was very carefully chosen. By introducing it one wanted to assimilate the red cross to the public coats of arms. This is important for the protection of the emblem as such. Apart from the article in the Geneva convention prohibiting the abuse of the emblem, there is the convention for the protection of industrial property that prohibits the abuse of public coats of arms. Before speaking about the abuse of the red cross emblem I must make it clear that there are in fact two quite different means of employing the red cross emblem. We may even call it two different emblems that only have the figure and colour in common. First and most important of all there is the protective emblem that is nearly the constitutive element of the convention. It is the distinctive emblem of a red cross on a white ground that shall be displayed on the flags, armlets and on all equipment employed in the medical service (art. 39). This protective emblem may only be used to indicate or protect in war or peace time medical units and establishments and the personnel and material that are protected under the provisions of the convention. I think we all understand the high significance of the protective emblem that has proved its practical and moral value during more than a century already. But there is another red cross emblem, the indicative emblem. This is employed only to indicate that a certain person or an object has a link with red cross as an institution, without giving any protection of the convention. The national Red Cross societies and the two international Red Cross bodies, the ICRC and the League of Red Cross societies, may use according to art. 44, 2nd and 3rd paragraph, this indicative emblem and the name



of the red cross for their activities. In war time the indicative emblem must be carried in such a way that it cannot be confounded with the protective emblem. On the whole it shall be comparatively small and may never be employed on armlets or painted on buildings.

You may well understand that in this field many questions can arise to which the answer varies from country to country. For instance, the display of the Red Cross flag and emblems for fundraising campaigns or as badges for members or contributors.

In this connection it must be stated that there is no definite form of the emblem. It is quite understandable that the convention for practical reasons does not give explicit measures for the cross or demands of a definite colour. This however lays a great responsibility on the Red Cross organisation. In order to maintain the valuable goodwill of the emblem and the high moral significance of it, they must avoid to have the red cross mixed up with other figures. Their emblem is essentially a red cross on a white ground. For this reason the flag showing a red cross with four blue anchors as employed by the ships of the Sovjet Rescue Service cannot be considered as a red cross flag. As this rescue service is not carried out as an activity of the Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies of the USSR, it is not at all entitled to use the red cross emblem even without blue anchors.

Still there are certain other organisations that have the right to use the emblem for their personnel and establishment, namely the institutions recognised as auxiliaries to the medical services in war time, according to art.

26. The national Red Cross societies are by far the most important suppliers of such auxiliary personnel and material. Others are the Sovereign Order of Malta and the Order of St. John. Since the second convention, dealing with maritime warfare, gives protection to the small coastal rescue boats and their equipment on land the coastal rescue organisations may also employ the emblem if they are recognised by their national government. It is clear that this sees only to the protective emblem used in wartime. The institutions just named may not employ the red cross in peace or wartime for indicating



their personnel or equipment.

It is evident that the abuse of the protective emblem is much more serious than that of the indicative emblem. The abuse of the red cross and the fight against it are nearly as old as the emblem itself. First the abuses were committed in wartime against the protective emblem, but from about 1880 when the red cross has become an established notion, all sorts of people tried to draw commercial advantage from it. The red cross appeared on pillboxes or on labels for mineralwater bottles. Chemists and even barbershops had it as their signboards, etc. In the revised convention of 1906 the parties obliged themselves to take the necessary legal measures against the abuse of the protective as well as the indicative emblem. But in order to escape the interdiction some less scrupulous merchants found a new method: they began to use the Swiss colours taking advantage of the close analogy between the two crosses, the red one on a white ground and the white one on a red ground. So the conference of 1929 had to tackle this problem and indeed the revised convention of that year introduced the prohibition of the use of the coats of arms of the Swiss federation or imitations thereof. I think this is the only example of particular coats of arms protected against abuse in international law. I have already mentioned the convention for the protection of industrial property that prohibits in general the use of public coats of arms and state emblems for commercial use.

Besides the commercial use of the red cross there is an abuse, committed in good faith, that nevertheless cannot be tolerated. I mean the use of the red cross by doctors and other medical people who want to indicate for instance their cars. It is a mistake to think that the red cross may be employed for all activities regarding the fight against diseases; therefore the CICR has always been in favour of the introduction of the emblem of Aesculapius for the members of the medical profession. In general the Committee is cooperating actively in searching other emblems for those who need a special mark, such as the civil defence personnel.

In this connection I would like to ask your attention for an emblem that has been rightly called "the red cross for

monuments". It is an escutcheon quartered of blue and white that was adopted by the convention of the Hague for the protection of cultural goods in time of war of may 14th 1954. Maybe you have seen it in Naarden or near the entrance of the Muiderslot. This new convention cannot be imagined without the tradition of goodwill established by its forerunners, the Geneva Red Cross conventions.

13.55 p.m.

M. Georges Pasch, Paris: LA CROIX SUR LES DRAPEAUX

La vexillologie est née avec l'héraldique à l'époque des Croisades et la croix se trouve à la base de la symbolique européenne. L'étude de ce symbole permet, grâce à son ancienneté et à l'ampleur des questions diverses, qu'elle soulève de traiter le sujet en demeurant sur le terrain de la science générale et constitue de ce fait la démonstration de ce que la science des drapeaux est une discipline indépendante, possédant sa doctrine propre.

A. Le symbole de la croix. La croix est un objet matériel, mais servant de message: il relève donc de l'ethnographie et des moyens de transmission des idées. Un sens symbolique lui est attaché. Certains symboles sont purement conventionnels ou historique. D'autres par contre se rattachent aux réalités du monde: tel le signe de la croix, dont les deux branches, horizontale et verticale sont des symboles du passif et de l'actif. Ceci est attesté par toutes les cosmogonies, par la métaphysique, la philologie et les gestes universellement compris. La réunion en un tout des deux idées fondamentales représente donc l'univers, le tout.

Ceci ne contredit pas l'origine historique de la croix chrétienne. En effet, la croix ne figure pas parmi les symboles primitifs des chrétiens; image d'un supplice infamant elle ne s'imposa que difficilement (la croix de Jésus était d'ailleurs en forme d'un T et non d'une croix) et lorsque la nouvelle religion eut besoin d'un