

part of our lives and resist militarized conceptions of gender, race, sexuality and other differences. I also cautiously agree with Koskenniemi's suggestion that achieving global security involves empowering the more democratic General Assembly to play a central role in peacebuilding, thereby reducing the scope of the Security Council's powers, even though the Assembly has not proved to be any less masculinist than the Council. His strategy opens another dimension of the relentless convergence of state interests and subordinating narratives of gender, that feminists must also tackle. Which leads me to stress the critical importance of local and transnational women's movements and solidarities, in the struggle to address the underlying causes of global insecurity. In total, this is an ambitious project - a feminist reimagining - which has, at least, some post-Cold War rhetorical support from the highest levels of the UN bureaucracy.

Conclusion

The claim by Boutros Boutros-Ghali in 1992 that the UN has become the world's most active peacekeeper in the post-Cold War period is something which it might reasonably be expected that feminists would welcome and support. Principles like the non-use or minimal use of force, consent of the parties, respect for human rights, democratic processes and the rule of law, the development of military expertise in the use of non-lethal methods and weapons, even the broader definitions of what might constitute threats to international peace and security seem to, in some ways at least, respond to many feminist critiques of global militarism. But do these principles simply cloak the same global elites in a newly palatable legal and humanitarian disguise?