

Evenso, it seems clear that peacekeeping forces are learning to respond to conflict situations by using an array of peaceful, or minimally forceful, dispute resolution techniques. Further, they are applying these techniques with a broad range of non-military personnel including civilians, NGOs, government officials, non-military members of peacekeeping missions and civilian police, as well as with the disputing parties and multi-national peacekeeping forces.

The developments in military training and practice, although emphatically secondary to the war-oriented and protective military discourse, potentially have far-reaching implications. Although these developments have taken place *within* a military framework, and therefore could hardly be considered *de-militarized*, they could assist in reversing the hitherto intractable trumping of humanitarian considerations by military necessities. They could change the ways in which militaries understand themselves and lead to a reimagining of the militarized world order so that it is no longer dependent on notions of dominating masculinities and subordinate femininities in order to legitimate sending soldiers to war.⁷¹ These developments could raise the profile and increase the capabilities of chapter VI actions so that chapter VII eventually becomes redundant.

Renegotiating Militarized Constructions of Gender

The archetypal militarized male gender roles are also undergoing a process of change because of a second important shift: the increasing participation of women, and of openly homosexual men, in the regular armed forces of many states. As Cynthia Enloe argues, Cold War militarism relied on the idea that *real* men were those who were prepared to kill for their country, which required that women were

⁷⁰ Ibid 10.

⁷¹ Rebecca Grant, "The Quagmire of Gender and International Security" in V Spike Petersen (ed),