

*Canadian Institute for  
International Peace and Security*

360 Albert Street  
Suite 900  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada  
K1R 7X7

and elegantly written book on the question of peace ethics in international relations. The work was recently awarded the prestigious Lionel Gelber prize, awarded annually for the best book on international relations written in English.

The code of peace, as defined by the author, constitutes "a set of authoritative principles and rules of conduct" which guides relations between states. The code of peace, which is composed of a number of underlying principles, is intended to inhibit the war-making mode of sovereign states. With camera-like precision, Jones focuses on seemingly isolated historical episodes, individual political figures and specific conference texts and successfully integrates these diverse strands in tracing the historical development of those ethical principles which collectively constitute the code of peace.

The book advances three central propositions: first, there exist ethical standards which guide the conduct of international relations; moreover, they are not merely theoretical postulates advanced by moral philosophers or peace researchers, but principles endorsed by governments themselves after considerable experience and reflection, and registered in numerous conventions, treaties, pro-

tion, the author takes the corpus of some seventy-nine international protocols, treaties, conventions, and declarations as convincing evidence for the existence of a comprehensive code of ethics of peace. This particular peace code incorporates nine distinct principles on which states are in essential agreement: the sovereign equality of states; territorial integrity and political independence; non-intervention in the internal affairs of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; abstention from the threat or use of force; fulfilment in good faith of international obligations; cooperation with other states; and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Two auxiliary principles – creation of an equitable international economic order and protection of the environment – are also listed. There exists broad, but no universal, consensus on these last two; with the differences arising less over the principles themselves than the strategies to implement them.

Historically, the development of these peace principles can be traced to the 19th century, even though many of them have their origin in the peace system of Westphalia. Prior to World War I,

the protection of human rights and essential freedoms a necessary condition for international peace and security.

With respect to the universality of the peace code, the author cites numerous regional and global declarations which reflect most or all of these principles. In this context it is interesting to note that the 1955 Bandung conference, which launched the non-alignment movement, reiterated at least seven of the nine underlying peace principles even though the latter had evolved from the Eurocentric system of power politics that the non-aligned nations strove to reject.

"In the final analysis," Ms. Jones notes, "it made little difference whether a state was new or old, African, Asian, or European. The problems of the state as a state were the same, and the principles invoked to help solve the problems were the same as well." The important contribution of the new states assembled at Bandung was to add a more dynamic element like international social justice to the more static traditional principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention.

The third key proposition contained in the book is that peace ethics do matter in the conduct of international relations. However, this section is the least developed aspect of the work. One basic

shortcoming in translating the peace code into concrete action stems from the inherent contradictions between several of its supporting principles. In policy practice, the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention frequently clash with those of human rights and self-determination. Even morally scrupulous statesmen, and they are a rare breed, may be hard pressed in implementing the peace code when faced with such contradictions.

To be sure, such contradictions can sometimes be mitigated. Jones cites the 1920 Aaland Islands dispute in which the ultimate aim of the islanders for cultural and linguistic autonomy could be safeguarded by an enlightened Finnish minority policy without the formal exercise of self-determination, an option which the League ruled to be incompatible with the principle of Finnish sovereignty and integrity. In some cases these contradictions may be transcended altogether, as occurred with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accord after the fall of communism in Eastern Europe and the end of the Cold War.

As a student of international relations, this reviewer would have welcomed an attempt by the author to provide a critical evaluation which sought to distinguish between the mere rhetoric of peace ethics as a public relations exercise, and their actual function in taming the warlord mode that is present in every sovereign state in the international system.

– *Harald von Riekhoff*

*Mr. von Riekhoff is professor of political science at Carleton University.*

Reviews of French language publications can be found in *Paix et Sécurité* "Livres" section.