

examples of gender-differentiated consequences of such actions concern the growing number of complaints of rape by peacekeepers, the harsh effects of economic sanctions on women, and women's status in militarized cultures.⁴⁶

These are hardly neutral outcomes, yet critical views like Orford's are silenced or discredited in the "warm glow" of the official narratives of the post Cold War collective security system. It is all too apparent that the new discourse of global insecurity continues to rely on the silences of women and other less powerful groups. The effect is to endorse the Security Council's unaccountable power and self-interest, and to legitimate the way in which the Security Council orders and narrates the world by authorizing military and economic coercion in order to protect, first and foremost, the interests of the global *status quo*.

The Extension of Militarism

The post-Cold War blurring of the boundaries between peacekeeping and peace enforcement has the effect of extending the scope of the legal use of force in international law. In eroding the non-violent and non-coercive foundational principles of peacekeeping operations, the Security Council's authorization of the collective use of force to achieve humanitarian goals is expanding what passes for "military necessity". Historically, the underlying assumption in the development of laws of war has been that it is possible to humanize war through law by striking a balance between judgments of military necessity and humanitarian considerations. However, when we look more closely at the history of war we see, as Chris af Jochnick and Roger Normand have argued, that "the development of a more elaborate legal regime has proceeded apace with the increasing savagery and destructiveness of modern war".⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Orford, above n 38, 377.

⁴⁷ Chris af Jochnick and Roger Normand, "The Legitimation of Violence: A Critical History of the Laws of War" (1994) 35 *Harvard International Law Journal* 49, 55.