

of too few states, too many nations, and too many illegitimate states leads to heightened levels of violence.

Robert Ross (Boston College) examined the role of balance of power considerations in East Asia. He argued that there are two great powers in the region – the U.S. and China. Has this bipolar relationship fostered balancing and stability? The issue of maritime vs. land hegemony played itself out well in his discussion, as China is a land hegemon and the U.S. a maritime one. Thus, China is playing the role lost by the USSR in 1989 in the region. It is attempting to balance the U.S. in terms of military expenditures, but cannot match the U.S. power. It is only focusing on access denial – pushing the U.S. as far out to sea as possible. He concluded by arguing that this is a good balance of power – there is no risk for surprise attack by either hegemon, and intentions, while not clear, are definitely not feared.

Open discussions led to the following points being emphasized:

- How will the dependence of China on the US economy play out in its capabilities to balance the U.S.?
- Is Japan not a great power? Is not Russia? We need to look at impressions of their power versus the reality of their power.
- We need to look at two potential types of balancing – internal vs. external. Internal refers to domestic defence build-up, external deals with alliance formation. How does this relate to the hard vs. soft balancing discussed by T.V. Paul?

Session VI continued with the focus on Asia, looking at both South East Asia and South Asia. Brian Job (UBC) examined the southeast Asian case, arguing that three types of balancing are going on in the region:

- Localized balancing against other regional states (keep state/regime security)
- The region as a balance of power theatre (increase status of small states)
- A region with strategies of balancing to influence the great powers (gain from great powers)

The main states in the region use all three tools to make sure that they keep the U.S. in the region and that China remains a good regional power.

Raju Thomas focused his discussion on the uses of balance of power in South Asia, arguing that balance of power policies and outcomes, after 3500 years of history in the region, are a new phenomenon, and thus European in origin. In the modern context, how have states that are not used to the idea of balance of power used it? Thomas argues that prior to the Kosovo conflict of 1999, India, China, and Russia were using a policy of balancing against the U.S. through action, but in rhetoric were talking bandwagoning – working on the side of the U.S.. After Kosovo, and especially after September 11, this has changed, where India, China and Russia have overtly bandwagoned with the U.S., but