following this logic, is the intellectual method of challenging the apparently gender-neutral principles. Following that, the book observes the way the international legal world reacts to this "exotic anomaly". After reviewing the long history of feminist activism in international law, the journey of the term "gender" is outlined, which shows similar controversies and chaos. The last part of the new introduction turns to the agenda "Women, Peace and Security" (WPS), with which Chinkin is deeply engaged. She reminds the readers that the WPS agenda simplified feminist ideas. Further, the agenda reduces the meaning of "gender" to "women," assumes women to be "good with peace" without exploring women's agency, and focuses on sexual violence but fails to investigate the inequalities at the heart of the violence.

In the main content of the book, the authors borrow feminist theoretical "weapons" and place the international legal regime under a microscope, including the very basics of international law such as treaties, the idea of the state, dispute settlements, and topics such as human rights and the use of force, from which emerges an unfamiliar and gendered international landscape, with a seemingly deliberate intention to cause discomfort in its analysis of the law of treaties or the idea of the state.

As impressed as I am by this groundbreaking contribution, idealists may find it frustrating that the feminist approach to international law has been shrinking into a narrower, simpler sense. Also, general global development following the book's initial publication has shown a very selective character, with significant attention being paid to human rights law, humanitarian law, and international criminal law, but with limited impact on any change in the world's patriarchal structure.

The "age" of the book further compels the learning of newly emerged feminist theories as necessary. Currently, the critique of feminist approaches is more diversified and includes, for example, queer feminism or anti-imperialist feminism, covering more agendas and challenging the international legal structure in a more radical though, perhaps, marginalized way.[1] This challenge will continually refresh and update itself as with feminism's inherently vibrant logic.

Competing interests. None.

doi:10.1017/S2044251324000158

Rwanda Revisited: Genocide, Civil War, and the Transformation of International Law

edited by Phillip DREW, Bruce OSWALD, Robert McLAUGHLIN, and Jeremy FARRALL. Leiden; Boston: Brill Nijhoff, 2021. xvi + 327 pp. Hardcover: €89.00; eBook (pdf): €89.00; MyBook: €25.00. doi: 10.1163/9789004430129

Amit UPADHYAY and Abhinav MEHROTRA

Jindal Global Law School, O.P. Jindal Global University, Sonipat, India

[1] Karen ENGLE, Vasuki NESIAH, and Dianne OTTO: "Feminist Approaches to International Law", in Jeffrey L. DUNOFF and Mark A. POLLACK, eds., *International Legal Theory: Foundations and Frontiers* (Cambridge University Press, 2022), 194–95.

The failure of peacekeeping missions in Rwanda exposed the incompetence of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) in preserving peace and security. The roots of the genocide in Rwanda lay in the environment of ethnic tensions and impunity, undermining the Arusha Accords signed between the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) and the Rwandan government. Despite early warning signs, the UNSC failed to prevent the genocide. The establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda (ICTR) paved the way for the further development of international criminal law. After three decades, the painful memories of the massacre remain fresh in the minds of those who suffered. This book is an excellent attempt at revisiting the genocide, where authors from various fields and roles discuss their personal experiences, stressing the ignorance and isolation that Rwanda suffered in 1994 at the hands of the international community, in particular the UNSC.

The book is coherently organized into four parts. Ambassador Colin Keating, in his chapter on "Rwanda: The Political Failure of the UN Security Council", describes the failure of the UNSC as manifested through the lack of political will to implement the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect through preventive action under Chapter VI or effective action under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Phillip Drew and Brent Beardsley argue in their chapter, "Do Not Intervene: UNAMIR's Rule of Engagement from the Inside", that the "Do Not Intervene" principle was legally incorrect, operationally nonsensical, and led to the loss of lives. Phillip Drew also found that the pattern of the Rwandan genocide largely resembled that of the Holocaust as in both cases racism as an ideology was propounded, and both hate propaganda and organized extermination campaigns were carried out.

Unlike most existing scholarship dealing with genocide and crimes against humanity, this book unusually uses a multidisciplinary approach and provides perspectives on the political, legal, and governance failures of the UNSC in dealing with the genocide. In particular, Part 2, in examining the genesis of the offence of genocide, serves as a distinctive contribution for two significant reasons. First, by attaching importance to the non-legal debates of genocide as an offence. Second, by emphasizing the significance of the role of culture as an important attribute for the offence of genocide which has been defined under Article 6 of the Rome Statute to target a particular racial, religious, national, or ethnical group.

This publication, though, would benefit from a different and clearer presentation strategy by rearranging some content. For example, Chapter 3 in Part I, which deals with the UNSC's response to the genocide in Rwanda, appears to serve the theme of Part 3 better, which deals with prosecuting genocide. Yet, we believe the authors and editors have provided an excellent resource with varied perspectives on the Rwandan genocide and lessons for the international community in the future.

Competing interests. The authors declare none.

doi:10.1017/S2044251324000092