

Reprinted from *The Scholar*, February 1934.

The Banner of Peace.

BY DR. JAMES BROWN SCOTT

THE
SCHOLAR PRESS,
PALGHAT

Reprinted from *The Scholar*, February 1934.

The Banner of Peace.

BY DR. JAMES BROWN SCOTT

[A world-renowned authority on International Law, Dr. James Brown Scott is also the Director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C. He is the author of several books on this subject and holds the honoured position of President of the American Institute of International Law, and has been a delegate or expert at several international assemblies on both Continents. His powerful support to the Cause is an event of great importance and, therefore, we gladly print here the speech he made at the last Washington Convention, (November 17 & 18, 1933) urging the adoption of the Pact. We also invite the attention of our readers to the sure support which the Pact is receiving, as evidenced by the latest heartening news from Montevideo (South America) published elsewhere in this issue.

—Editor.]



It would be permissible, I believe, to say that we all have pity for ourselves; and it would be none the less correct to observe that in times past, at least nations have not taken pity on others, unless they felt that their own interests were in some degree involved. What the members of this Association want, what the audience here to-night wants, what I myself devoutly desire, is the large sympathy which shall make one of the many and merge us all in a common humanity.

The purpose of this meeting is to endorse "an international covenant for the protection of artistic and scientific institutions, missions and collections," proposed by Nicholas Roerich, Russian



THE ARCHIVE OF
NICHOLAS
ROERICH
MUSEUM

by birth and by preference a citizen of the world, in order that the culture of the past, the culture of the present and the culture of the future may stand as monuments and as an expression of the universality of culture,—for things material, are they not national?—and that the imponderables, the things which, once conceived and executed, are our common treasure, may not, as in the past, perish in armed conflict as have so often those who have created them. Our poet Lowell, has he not said, and in two perfect lines :

That love of one from which there doth not spring
Wide love for all, is but a worthless thing.

We all know from the recent and tragic experience, which, like all tragic experiences, is in danger of being forgotten in the scramble for the material pleasures and comforts of life in a civilization which the French describe as *la civilisation du comfortable*, that war is destructive not only of human life but of the highest achievements of life in art and in science and the things of the spirit which, taken together, we call our culture. The mere taking of life is not the worst of war. We know that our days are numbered—although, fortunately for most of us, we do not have the numbers—and, therefore war may be said, from this point of view, merely to accelerate a natural process. Yet in this acceleration how many Platos, how many Tullys,—to use the name by which Cicero was intimately and affectionately known to our fathers—how many Dantes, Shakespeares and Molières, how many Velasqueze's and Cervantes, how many Pascals, how many Beethovens and Goethes ; in a word, how many Leonardos, have passed through the ages without a record of their passing ?

Again, war has no appreciable relation to justice ; the genius of a commander, the strength of battalions, will cause force to triumph at the expense of right and justice. What we wish, and what we must have, is a single standard for men and for nations ; that the rights and duties of the individual may be the rights and duties of nations, composed of individuals ; and that the disputes between nations, as well as individuals, shall be settled by judicial tribunals. The first great and epoch-making step, has it not been taken ? Is not a Permanent International Court of Justice established at The Hague, and is it not to-day, this very day, in session, busied with disputes between nations as our national courts are busied with the disputes of individuals, each tribunal, whether national or international, applying the same standard of law, of justice and of morality ?

We do not wish to—indeed, we dare not—revert to the days of which M. Jusserand spoke when he honoured us by his presence as Ambassador of France to the United States—days which

we might think of as “long ago ;” were it not for the Greatest of Wars, whose fateful consequences both vex and plague us still. “Former-day chroniclers,” M. Jusserand said some twenty-three

years ago before the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, “are wont to mention, as a matter of course, that ‘the king went to the wars in the season,’ as he would have gone a-fishing. People at large saw not only beauty in war..... but they saw in it an unmixed beauty.....Such were,” he added in justification—

Montevideo.
Following the unanimous adoption of the Roerich Pact and Banner of Peace by the Third International Peace Banner Convention held in Washington on Nov. 17—18th 1933, which was attended by 34 countries, the Plenary Session of the Pan-American Congress (of all the countries of both the Americas), adopted unanimously the Roerich Pact and Banner of Peace and resolved to recommend its adoption to the Governments of North and South America.

and I pause to say that history is greatly in need of justification—“the feelings of the day. To none of the master artists who represented the day of judgment on the walls of Rome, Orvieto or Padua, or on the porches of our Northern Cathedrals, did the thought occur to place among his fierce angels driving the guilty to their doom, one with a tear

on his face; a tear would have made the artist more famous than all his art; a tear not because the tortures could be supposed to be unjust or the men sinless, but because they were tortures and because the men had been sinful. *Dies irea!*”

What does this our organization stand for, and what is its symbol? From Mr. Roerich's proposed international covenant I lift two phrases from the preamble and two short paragraphs pregnant with hope—and indeed of an assured fulfilment, if not to-day, in the days to come :

Whereas the Institutions dedicated to the education of Youth, to Arts and to Sciences, constitute a common treasure of all the Nations of the World

(The High Contracting Parties)

Have resolved to conclude a solemn covenant for perfecting the protection enjoyed in all civilized countries by Institutions and Missions dedicated to Arts and Sciences and by artistic and scientific collections.

To realize this cultural and humanitarian purpose, Article I of the pact proposes that

Educational, artistic and scientific institutions, artistic and scientific missions, the personnel, the property and collections of such institutions and missions shall be deemed neutral and as such, shall be protected and respected by belligerents.

And the second and concluding paragraph of the article provides that

Protection and respect shall be due to the aforesaid institutions and missions in all places, subject to the sovereignty of the High Contracting Parties, without any discrimination as to the State allegiance of any particular institution or mission.

In addition to the obligation created by the international agreement, there is both a procedure and a remedy. The procedure consists in registration of the institutions, collections and missions with the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation at Paris or the Pan-American Union in Washington, according to the desire of each of the high contracting parties involved. This registration entitles the various institutions to display the distinctive flag of the international covenant, and to have special protection and respect of their neutral rights on the part of belligerents; and, in case of complaint due to violation of the covenant, any one of the artistic and scientific institutions, collections and missions shall possess the right, through the intervention of its government, to have the complaint passed upon by an international commission of inquiry, to be established under a special agreement. The three-fold spheres on the distinctive flag thus imply the three-fold nature of the pact,—obligation, procedure and remedy.

Drafted by one George Chklaver, the project bears incontrovertible evidence of the deft hand of Albert de la Pradelle, the friend of every worthy international cause, and the successor of the incomparable Louis Renault in the chair of international law in the University of Paris.

So much for this cultural and humanitarian pact! But what of the symbol? The Good Book says that "an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas."¹ Therefore, I have chosen the more neutral—and, I hope, acceptable—term of symbol. It is a banner, a flag, a piece of bunting if you will, three magenta spheres within a magenta circle on a white ground, symbol of eternity and unity, surrounded by perhaps another circle, a symbol of culture and humanity, past, present and future. Mr. Roerich—sponsor of the pact as well as artist of the banner—holds that it is "imperative to take immediate measures to

¹ King James' version of the Gospel according to St. Matthew the 12th Chapter, 39th Verse.

preserve the noble heritage of our past for a glorious posterity," adding that "the creations of culture.....belong to no one nation but to the world."

It is, as I have said, a banner, a flag, a bit of bunting, with an inscription indicative of a great idea, and, like all great ideas, it is international without mention of any one nation or a suggestion of the intervention of any one person. It is culture, humanity at its highest, past, present and future.

When Mr. Roerich's idea is incorporated in an international agreement, it will share the fate of all international agreements. The name of those who have stood for it and defended it, and of those to whose efforts it is due, will be merged in the great achievement.

We have recently had an example of this: in the United States we generally speak of the "Kellogg Peace Pact," because of its connection with Secretary of State Kellogg; in France it is often called the "Briand Pact," because of Mr. Briand's connection with it as Minister of Foreign Affairs; then at times the names of the two are united, as becomes true brothers of peace, and we speak of it indifferently as the "Kellogg-Briand Pact" or the "Briand-Kellogg Pact". But the document signed by some fifteen nations in the Quai d'Orsay on the 27th day of August, 1928—and adhered to by the civilized world—was the "Pact of Paris". And when and if, through Mr. Roerich's initiative, his pact shall be signed and ratified by the civilized nations, the document drafted by the individual will become the pact of the nations for the preservation of their culture from the destruction which inevitably follows in the wake of any war, whether it be large or small, civil or international.

Possessors of the culture of the past, trustees of the culture of the present for the future, we shall, by the signature of a universal pact, set up a universal standard for culture and humanity, past, present and the future, and at the same time a universal standard for nations and their international relations.

