

while other hegemonic states have not faced a coalition of balancers;

- The Dutch in the 17th Century, the United Kingdom in the 19th Century, and the United States in the 20th and 21st Centuries.

Several of the subsequent discussions, including the examination of maritime versus continental hegemony, dealt with this puzzle.

One of the main issues that was raised in this context was the fact that balancing or balance of power can be seen as two possible things; either as an outcome or as a selected policy choice by states in the international system.

After the two panel presentations were completed, the open discussion raised several issues that would remain central to debate over the course of the conference:

- In a partial response to Levy's puzzle, the difference between land based hegemony and naval based hegemony and their balancing efforts came into discussion, stating that geography mattered in balancing considerations.
- Definitional problems were also raised – many in the group suggested that there would be a need to set out clear definitions in order to examine balance of power in a unified manner.
- Can we take states as being rational, unitary, and sole actors in the international system, as realists do? Examining balance of power from a regional, and not systemic, point of view can have important effects on conceptions of the state and the level of anarchy needed to be considered.

After the lengthy discussion on concerns of methodology and definition, the second session examined balance of power from non-traditional approaches; power transitions theory and international political economy (IPE). Douglas Lemke (University of Michigan) presented the power transition approach to understanding balancing in the international system. To Lemke, hegemonic powers will structure relations in the international system to their benefit. Rising powers will challenge the systemic or regional hegemon (status quo power). This eventually will lead to conflict. In the present context, the United States is attempting to change domestic structures in states around the world so that they become satisfied with the relations as structured by itself. Thus the risk for war declines in the future.

Mark Brawley (McGill University) offered a response to the question of why the U.S. is not balanced, using an IPE approach. By focusing on international regimes, he argued that there is little balancing going on versus the U.S. due to both a normative and ideological consensus between states and international regimes and the U.S., as well as a consensus on economic development strategies and goals. International regimes help stabilize international relations by deepening this international consensus.

Some of the key points brought out during the open discussion included: