

A second issue was funding. Peacebuilding is very costly. And while there is a commendable willingness to invest in the process, the resources are not up to the task. Daudelin called attention to the problems being encountered in Kosovo where the peacebuilding mission operates on a very small budget and is constantly on the brink of insolvency. It is, in Daudelin's view, ridiculous for missions to constantly work for and worry about additional funding. Peacebuilding operations are totally dependent on the will and the whims of the United States and the European Union. Inadequate funding threatens the credibility and the consistency of interventions. Why invest resources, however inadequate, in Bosnia and not in Sierra Leone? This, he argues, has less to do with the seriousness of the threat than with the interests and whims of great powers. Daudelin suggested that an effort be made to delink funding for intervention from the great powers. Peacebuilding missions must be self-sustaining and peacebuilders should try to 'live off the land'. While noting the controversial nature of such a recommendation, for Daudelin there were two principal aspects he thought needed to be considered. One was for outsiders to avoid creating a dual economy, by living within local means rather than what they might be used to in New York or Geneva. A second was to look at ways of generating local capital to support peacebuilding operations, for example the use of oil revenues from Sudan or diamond profits from Sierra Leone.

A third issue involved in peacebuilding involves the North-South dimension of these operations. What is the place of the South in peacebuilding? Interventions have been mostly a Northern affair; whereby Northern states have determined where, when and how such interventions will occur. The big Southern countries are not even at the table. More pragmatic measures like the involvement of key Southern countries – Brazil, Mexico, China, India, Pakistan, and Indonesia, for example – should be taken. If they are involved, the colonial aspects of intervention will be reduced and the legitimacy of these operations will be strengthened.

A fourth and final issue is that of national interests and the extent to which these guide interventions. On the one hand, interventions challenge the national interest – the whole concept of