

- Defining September 11 as balancing is false – Bin Laden did not want to balance the U.S., he wanted to destroy the U.S.
- Does the balance of power need to focus on the survival of the state system or is it to strive for the security of regimes?

Session IV began the lengthy discussion of regional subsystems and the balance of power. Robert Art (Brandeis University) examined the use of institutionalization in Western Europe to examine both economic and security balancing versus the United States. He argued that there has been significant balancing within Europe, both economically and in the security sphere, especially vs. Germany post-1989. He argues that both Maastricht (Economic and Monetary Union and European Political Union) were attempts by France to balance against potential German hegemony in Europe. He then argues that there has been little in the way of balancing against the U.S. on the security front, but that economically there has been some. This is due partly, and as it has been discussed before, to the fact that the hegemonic system, as designed by the United States, satisfies the demands of the Europeans, and as such does not elicit balancing. Secondly, on the military front, this is due to the fact that the Europeans do not see themselves as a global military power.

William C. Wohlforth (Dartmouth College) puzzles over why there has been no balancing between Russia and its former Soviet republics in Central Asia and Eastern Europe. He examines this question by looking at two different types of balancing – BOP1 and BOP2. BOP1 refers to the classical understanding of balancing actions (alliances, military spending, etc.) that are not really thinkable in a region with Russia as the hegemon. BOP2 balancing, on the otherhand, refers to subtle balancing (such as international diplomacy to balance the US), and as such can have a more important impact on analysing state actions in the region.

In the open discussion, two key points were raised:

- Can the Maastricht treaty on economic and political union be seen as balancing, when Germany ostensibly gave up power? Can we call a situation when a hegemon gives up power balancing?
- Is the use of BOP1 and BOP2 similar to T.V. Paul's distinction between hard a soft balancing, and as such a way to strengthen the use of the two types of balancing.

On Saturday, the sessions moved into full gear, discussing the regional evidence of the relevance of balance of power. Session V examined the regional implications of balance of power in the Middle East and East Asia. Benjamin Miller (Duke University) examined the validity of taking states as rational unitary actors when examining them at the regional/sub-systemic level. He argues that instead of using the traditional realist approach, states need to be examined through the lens of the relationship between the state and the nation. Where there is an imbalance between state and nation, there will be an automatic rise in the level of violence in a region. In the Middle East, the combination