

- By bringing in the international regime, economic interdependence argument, the point brought up in the first session on hard vs. soft balancing gained a deeper appreciation.
- But bringing in economic balancing also raised the question of when does the search for economic growth become a policy of balancing against a hegemonic economic power?
- One of the other issues brought up here focused on the definition of a status quo power – what does it mean to be a status quo power – is it institutional or something else?
- Due to the revolution in military affairs, where great powers can fight wars without suffering casualties, economic balancing will become even more central to our understanding of balance of power in the future.

Session III focused on the issue of new security challenges, especially from non-traditional sources, and the relevance of the concept of balance of power. Chris Layne (University of Miami) posited that terrorism, as we saw on September 11, is the “anti-hegemonic balancing of the weak.” The spread of weapons of mass destruction (ie. nuclear, chemical and biological) is the biggest threat to the traditional monopoly of power held by states since the Treaty of Westphalia. Why have states not challenged the position of the U.S. in the international system? Because the U.S. does not allow for challengers. But he concludes by stating that at some point, the U.S. will reach too far, and balancing by other states will be the final outcome.

James Wirtz (Naval Post-Graduate School) examined the paradox that, while almost no state in the international system can take on the hegemon, they do anyways. By looking at defence expenditures, the US is equal to the next 20-30 competitors combined in the international system. Yet states seem to be balancing it using asymmetrical means. This discussion of why weaker states attempt to balance also had regional implications, as smaller states many times challenge stronger ones in the regions.

Ed Rhodes looked at the breakdown of the relationship between the Clausewitzian trinity between society, the state, and the military in war making. While it used to be that militaries fought militaries in open conflicts, it is no longer the case, especially since September 11. Societies fight societies (Sept. 11), or militaries fight societies (Kosovo). The potential spread of nuclear weapons furthers the breakdown of this trinity. Thus, rather than balancing to allow their states to survive, they balance to keep the state system intact. Implications for the balance of power are:

- We need to balance threats, not power
- We need to be concerned with the preponderance of power, not the balance of power

Open discussion during session III focused on: