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Abstract:

A difficult reality for international affairs specialists to face is that, despite solid effort and reams of research over the years, few real gains have been made in understanding or predicting world events. Narrative research in international affairs has been criticized for failing to solidly prove causality. Positivist research is progressing to better quantify political data and show causality, but it deals poorly with subjective information. The problem with international events is that they contain an enormous number of complex variables, many of which we have little idea how to measure. To address these problems, researchers narrow the focus of their study to control the immense number and complexity of their variables. The quantification of complex social events, however, inevitably leads to a skewed vision of the world from which little can be learned. Furthermore, if usable data begins to dictate the research, an accurate picture of the world is lost. As a result of these difficulties, researchers have sometimes ended up placing misguided attention on certain kinds of variables and have consequently failed to understand some world events when they do not relate to these particular variables. Additionally, political science has become so widely diversified that researchers find it hard to understand one another and to see events from the broadest perspective. Suggested here is a six category system to help recognize and order data from a political event. This system recognizes actors, actor preferences, actor assets and liabilities, actor behavior, actor relationships, and game outcomes. This system helps expand the database to include previously marginalized actors, and can suggest a common epistemological starting point for research, theory-making, and dialog among political scientists. Employing this ordering of event information should help researchers get a better overall picture of a political event from which they can better select variables for research and better construct experiments and theories. Well-known examples drawn from various international relations issues will be used to help illustrate how this categorization process works.
Part I - Introduction

International relations theory has led a difficult existence as a social science. Arguably the most noble of disciplines whose major intent, among others, has been the prevention of wars has never come close to such an ideal, nor has it been able to coherently explain such conflicts when they happen. Just when a generation of political scientists was beginning to grasp and sometimes even manage a bi-polar world, the Cold War ended, collapsing this structure and rendering it nearly as irrelevant as 'Checkpoint Charlie' now is in Berlin. The challenge facing international relations experts involves not only the observation and reporting of international events, but the understanding and management of them as well. The cause of these, so far, insurmountable difficulties is the highly complex nature of human political interaction. Our means of studying political phenomena needs improvement in order to begin to answer the questions that we have set out to ask.

Research in international relations has been conducted in a number of ways over time from Thucydides' descriptive account of the Peloponnesian War, to the prescriptive writing of Immanuel Kant, to the analytical writing of Hans Morgenthau.\textsuperscript{1,2} As insightful and elucidating as these approaches are, they do little for those practicing public policy

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}In Immanuel Kant's \textit{Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals}, his discussion of rational knowledge, reason, morals, and the Categorical Imperative create a means by which moral human behavior may be prescribed.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Hans Morgenthau's \textit{Politics Among Nations} describes a considerable number of historical events from which he draws general conclusions and generates his theory of power. This goes beyond Thucydides' story-like retelling of political events involving little universalizable analysis.
\end{itemize}
who need real guidance on what to do in real-life situations. Furthermore, lacking in all of these efforts is a truly causal theory which can be used to explain or predict how international events happen. Working to address this void, the positivist trend which swept through all social sciences has touched international relations as well. The understandable desire to generate empirically provable theory attracts researchers to the scientifically-oriented quantitative approach. Authors such as J. David Singer and Bruce Bueno De Mesquita helped introduce international relations to the quantification of human and state interaction.3 / 4 This positivist approach now commands the field despite a still limited ability to clearly instruct policy-makers on what to do, or adequately predict political events.5

International relations theory is faced, therefore, with two overall approaches; narrative, and positivist. The two are different in outlook and process, and, not surprisingly, the two beget different products. The narrative approach has the ability to describe and document a lot, but it usually proves little. The positivist approach is scientifically verifiable, but it requires a more narrow range of focus.6 Understandably, political scientists are reluctant to relinquish their capability to thoroughly chronicle political life in the way they see most fitting for an event, but they recognize the need, like

6 David A. Bositis, Research Designs for Political Science: Contrivance and Demonstration in Theory and Practice (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990), 12.
all scientists, to be able to prove something from their work. These methodological limitations create their own problems. The ideal situation would be to assist both of these two approaches in a way that their respective benefits may be exploited and their pitfalls avoided. Suggested here is a means of arranging all event data using the rational actor theoretical structure which will enable categorization of political events and information. With a new means of organizing data from a political event, researchers can more easily observe and select variables for further qualitative or quantitative, narrative or positive, normative or empirical study. At the same time, they will also be forced to make more informed and considered choices when selecting their research variables.

In the quest for simplicity in research and theory-building, much is lost. John Lewis Gaddis notes that political scientists, "know that if they do not impose such exclusions and controls, complications will quickly overwhelm their calculations, and predictability will suffer."7 This problem is very serious and carries major implications for the study of international relations theory. Historically under-represented actors such as women and the poor are ignored by researchers concentrating on issues they feel are more important like the Super Power conflict. Cynthia Enloe sees a serious problem in this research strategy which presumes those at the "margins, silences and bottom rungs" of political life cannot possibly have significance in world affairs.8 Enloe observes that

7 (John Lewis Gaddis 1992/1993, 55)
political scientist's ignore the tremendous amount of power which is exerted to keep those at the margins from moving to the center of the political arena. Failing to recognize this means ignoring a major part of the story.9 Ted Hopf supports Enloe's point when he looks at international relations researchers response to the end of the cold war. What political research that was being done in this area was fine. The problem, however, lay in what was not being done. There were various elements of political life researchers undervalued in the overall U.S./Soviet picture. These overlooked areas, such as low-level domestic sources of economic and political discontent, ended up being the leading cause of the break-up of the Soviet Union. Had we been forced to look at the bigger picture of what was happening in the Soviet Union in the 1980's, we might not have been so surprised when communism suddenly fell.10 Researchers in their singular concentration on whatever issues were popularly deemed most relevant, never considered the numerous internal pressures present within the Soviet Union as worthy topics of engagement during the Cold War. All of this underscores the fact that international relations researchers need a better way of systematically looking at the whole story to recognize what is really happening.

Marysia Zalewski states, "We need to re-think the discipline in ways that will disturb the existing boundaries of both what we claim to be relevant in international politics and what we assume to be legitimate ways of constructing knowledge about the world."11

---

9(Cynthia Enloe 1996, 188)
11Marysia Zalewski, "'All these theories yet the bodies keep piling up': theories, theorists, theorizing," in International Theory: Positivism and Beyond, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, & Marysia Zalewski (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 352.
Part II - Literature Review

Some see international relations theory to be nearly in the midst of a new renascence.\(^\text{12}\) Since World War II, international relations theory experienced few significant philosophical or practical challenges until the trend toward quantification of social events became the newest approach in social science research during the 1950's. This challenge, and the conflicts and confusion around this new approach has become known as the, so called, 'Second Debate.' Thirty years later, with little progress toward the resolution of that debate, a newer, though similar, dilemma has arisen. The 'Third Debate' opens up international relations theory to accommodate a greater variety of epistemological approaches. The historical research versus scientific method debate has never been adequately resolved as quantitative research methods permeate the social sciences; recent efforts by political scientists who have brought in critical theory, linguistic criticism, feminism, and third world perspectives have opened up political science to the most considered and widest range of theoretical dialog to date. Of course, the result is an impassioned and all-encompassing dialog which, in itself, is under debate as either strengthening and enriching the discipline or wasting everyone's time.\(^\text{13}\)

As a starting point, political scientists appear to agree that the goal of their work is


\(^{13}\text{K. J. Holsti, "Mirror, Mirror, on the Wall, Which Are the Fairest Theories of All?," International Studies Quarterly VOL. 33, NO. 3 (September 1989): 261.}\)
to understand international political events better. Doing so, it is believed, will lead us as citizens, corporations, and world leaders to be more effective in pursuing things like justice, economic growth, national security, and whatever else we might need. Remarkably, however, the above goal of international relations already generates controversy among political scientists. After World War II the, so-called, 'First Debate' in international relations theory arose over whether theorists should embrace traditional realism or the new liberalism. On the one hand, realism's concise world view easily focused attention on states and their power attributes. Liberalism, on the other hand, was better suited to addressing issues such as newly emerging cooperative world political and economic systems. One of the challenges of liberalism was that many of its ways of looking at the world could simply be seen as current problems with realism, and not any real new theory. Additionally, world leaders still behaved much as if other grass-roots or trans-national institutions did not exist and had no impact on their dealings.

Not long after Morgenthau's Politics Among Nations, which many herald as the starting point for modern international relations, and certainly the introduction of realism in international relations, researchers quickly began questioning exactly who or what was seeking to increase power. This has become known as the 'level of analysis' question. In Man, the State and War, neo-realist, Kenneth Waltz elaborated on this question in his

---


description of his various ‘images.’ The focus of the first image is on human behavior which is best exemplified by examination of the individual. The later images build on the theoretical foundation of the first in ways which then incorporate local and national governments and international structures. This work helped opened up international relations to a more serious consideration of the level of analysis issue.

Current international relations theory includes considerable research and discussion on the level of analysis issue. Everyone understands that there are international, national, regional, and local governing bodies which make laws and policy whose impact is felt far off, as well as various individuals, corporations, and organizations who engage in activities which play a role in international relations outcomes. Still, we understand poorly how this works. Additionally, basic questions such as what constitutes a level, how many are there, and which ones play which roles in international relations are still in need of answers. Structuralism in international relations seeks to specifically address these questions. Barry Gills maintains that theories and research focusing on the global level negate "the myriad of transformative processes, be they at the local, national, or global level which are at the heart of [structuralist] analysis." The means by which different level actors interact among one another, and which levels influence international affairs under what specific

---


kinds of world events are important questions for which answers must be sought.19

Rational actor theory in social science takes the 'actor' as a central concept. International relations theorists have had a generalized concept of actors as being governments. Researchers are learning, however, that the picture is far more complex than that. As will be discussed further on, actors are the essential critical element in political science; figuring out who they are, and the interactions they have among themselves is a complex, yet critical, undertaking.

In the past, international relations research was conducted using the narrative approach. Events and concepts were recorded in a linear story-like fashion reflecting political events as the writer viewed them. Depending upon the researchers perspective of an event, their understanding of the various aspects of the event, and their political or ideological bias, the narrative was always a picture of reality as seen through the eyes of the reporter or storyteller. Critics of narrative-based research charge that turning history into a story with a set beginning, middle, and end goes against the nature of history.20 Additionally, they charge that it is impossible for the narrative approach to really reflect any truth since it involves the subjective selection of data to tell the story.21 This distinction determines whether international relations theory is intended to be a normative or empirical undertaking. When value judgements are made, even including the selection

19(Barry Buzan 1995, 213)
20Andrew Norman, "Telling it Like it Was: Historical Narratives on their Own Terms," History and Theory VOL. 30, NO. 2 (1991): 126.
21(Andrew P. Norman 1991, 122)
of data, theory becomes a normative practice. When pure fact is reported, theory is thought to be empirical. This, however, will be discussed further below. Nazli Choucri discusses this distinction further when she writes about international relations forecasting.

"The value-neutral posture of science is sometimes confused with the value-driven imperatives of prophecy, resulting in an undifferentiated and often methodologically unsound use of both theory and method."23

As the social sciences developed during the post-war period, the trend toward the quantitative measure of social phenomena expanded. The scientific methods and procedures used in the physical sciences were found to have validity in political science. This movement toward the use of scientific methods in international relations has become known as the 'Second Debate' as researchers struggle over the role of historical and narrative based research methods versus scientific methods. Measurements enabling political scientists to understand the exact size and importance of political events and institutions have become the focus of attention. While studying scientific methods, political scientists have recognized another important benefit offered by this approach. The scientific method requires a logical consistency in the construction of theory and argument to accompany any quantitative research.24 Bruce Bueno de Mesquita writes, "No method, of course, can substitute for good theory and good empirical research; but


scientific methods can make more transparent whether problems have been dealt with adequately or not.\textsuperscript{25} Often lacking in research prior to this period was a means of establishing logical causal relationships between events in international relations as a means of predicting or explaining what happens in the world. Such features offer clear benefits over earlier non-empirical approaches which offer only possible conjectures for the future or plausible explanations for the past.

Game theory is another tool introduced to the discipline of international relations which is an outgrowth of the scientific method. Game theory is closely associated with utility theory and probability theory found in mathematics. Here, the likelihood of political event outcomes can be measured by assigning probability values to different actor choices throughout a game.\textsuperscript{26} Models of political events can be constructed to reflect situations where there are two players or more, where various levels of cooperation between players may or may not exist, where information may or may not be known or shared, and where player preferences and strategies known or not known.\textsuperscript{27} It is understood that game theory can only be applied in situations where actors behave in a purely rational manner, meaning that actors have some freedom to select among some choices to pursue the goals they wish to achieve.\textsuperscript{28} Political science and international relations have benefitted


\textsuperscript{27}(James D. Morrow 1994, chapters 3-9)

\textsuperscript{28}(James D. Morrow 1994, 7-8)
tremendously from game theoretical calculations on the behavior of different actors. Game theory models have been used to explain everything from the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor to trench warfare in World War I.29

Despite some of these real benefits which the scientific method has brought to international relations theory and research, it has brought problems as well. A number of problems arise when applying scientific methods to social science problems. First, the problem with this kind of research is that it only lends itself to the observation and consideration of certain kinds of facts and phenomena.30 That which can be counted is used in political research; that which cannot is not. The purpose of a model is to simplify the bigger picture of reality, but models are both good and bad. While they are very effective tools for bringing order and simplicity to a complex world, in doing so, they usually lose the full texture and meaning of reality when other variables are left out. James Morrow advises that the most important factor to consider when constructing a game theory model is to, "simplify, simplify, simplify."31 Doing so, however, precludes the thoroughness and comprehensiveness which comes with complexity. Extensive research during the Cold War focused on the military capabilities of various Eastern and Western bloc countries, but ignored many of the domestic issues facing states. It was these important but unexamined domestic issues which ultimately played the crucial role in the


31(James D. Morrow 1994, 312)
break up of the Soviet Union. Limiting the consideration and focus of study maintains the logical validity of the research argument, but does not necessarily guide us to an accurate understanding of international affairs. As John Lewis Gaddis writes, positivists "let method determine subject, with the consequences one might expect in any situation in which means are allowed to overshadow avowed ends." \(^{32}\)

A second problem encountered when employing scientific methods to answer political questions further involves the status of countable objects. As mentioned above, that which can be counted can be utilized in political research, and that which cannot is left unexamined. Political researchers have had a difficult time measuring subjective concepts like power, peace, justice, and morality. Measuring the effects of power or peace in world affairs is often done, but power and peace are quite different things from the effects of power and peace. These concepts are some of the most critical forces in international relations, and just as they are difficult to define, they are even more difficult to count.

Third, there are a number of ethical considerations as well. Since political events involve real people, issues of privacy, informed consent, "subject stress," and deception are all real possibilities.\(^{33}\) As well, it is not easy to generate unbiased research criticizing political elites or their policies after a researcher has worked hard to gain the access to and trust of such individuals to procure raw data. Researchers know that political elites, who

\(^{32}\)(John Lewis Gaddis 1992/1993, 26)

\(^{33}\)David A. Bositis, Research Designs for Political Science: Contrivance and Demonstration in Theory and Practice (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990), 130.
are often at the center of much international relations research, will be reluctant to cooperate in the future if they will only be damaged by the experience.\textsuperscript{34} The result is a strong incentive to construct data sets and infer conclusions which may or may not accurately reflect how the world really is.

Finally, as research into political behavior progresses on a given political event, unlike most objects of observation in the physical sciences, states, world leaders, and interest groups often involve themselves in the research as it is going on and often change their political behavior based on preliminary research findings gathered during the research program. The result is that the behavior of the actor being studied changes as a result of the research being done on it.\textsuperscript{35} Figuring out what variables effect which behavior and why becomes increasingly difficult because a new variable (that being a political actor’s response to research being done on it) is introduced into the system mid-study. The well known problem of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle observed in the hard sciences can occur wherever scientific methods are being used, including political science. If control of the data is lost, the research effort will be lost. This behavior makes understanding what is really going on that much more difficult.

There is no resolution to the controversy arising from the application of scientific method to international relations. The inadequacies of the scientific method combined

\textsuperscript{34}(David A. Bositis 1990, 131)

\textsuperscript{35}(David A. Bositis 1990, 10)
with other new influences, have created an opening for the 'Third Debate' in international relations theory. Just as scientific methods swept through political science thirty years before, the post-modern epistemological thinking developed in other fields has spread into political science as well. Post-modernism's deployment in international relations theory has provided even more legitimacy to theorists defection from pure scientific method. Post-modernism "reformulates basic questions of modernist understanding in emphasizing not the sovereign subject, or object, but instead the historical, cultural, and linguistic practices in which subjects and objects (and theory and practice, facts and values) are constructed." Effectively, what this means is that the yoke of scientific method which theorists have either eagerly or begrudgingly taken up loses it significance when faced with such constitutive challenges. While the post-modern debate is still far from over, it has helped open up international relations to many new perspectives.

The 'Third Debate' is based on a post-positivist construction of international relations theory. Post-positivism goes beyond the pure scientific method to shape this method to work more meaningfully in a social science setting. New epistemological frameworks and methodologies allow researchers greater latitude in research efforts. Yosef Lapid writes, "emerging from this self-imposed positivist trap,... the post-positivist counterpart - or counterparts - are far more accommodating in their acknowledged posture of tolerance and humility." While post-positivism offers excitement in its more

---


37 (Yosef Lapid 1989, 246)
inclusive approach to different perspectives, most agree that the scientific method should never be discarded, and, further, there is danger in going too far off course on questionable post-positive theoretical tangents.\(^{38/39}\)

Currently, international relations theorists are finding much wider latitude in which to work than they have in the past. The theoretical challenges, however, are much greater as well.\(^{40}\) Fundamental challenges such as what constitutes fact in international relations (as questioned by Post-modern theorists), which sets of facts should be selected for use (as questioned by Third World and Feminist theorists), and what should be done with them (as questioned by everyone) make research a sobering task.\(^{41}\) International relations is now at a point where there are models, theories, and approaches everywhere each being tested and critiqued, re-conceived and re-written in hopes of finding validity, legitimacy, and usefulness in world events. As international relations theory grows as a discipline, more approaches are tried and re-worked; none are perfect. There are many challenges we face in the Post-Cold War era, and international relations can and should play an


\(^{39}\) K. J. Holsti, "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, Which Are the Fairest Theories of All?," International Studies Quarterly VOL. 33, NO. 3 (September 1989): 261.


important role in living up to these challenges. \(^{42}\) It is reasonable to state that each theory or approach has certain salient features which are worthy of respect. Efforts should be made to preserve and promote such features as much as possible. The foregoing is an outline for assisting both the narrative/historical approach and the empiricist/positivist approach to international relations using the rational actor model as an organizing structure.

**Part III - The Six Category Purpose**

John Lewis Gaddis writes, "What we need now is a data base that would be equally relevant to the respective concerns of historians, political scientists, and policy makers, from which hypotheses could be constructed and tested, and on the basis of which we could begin a sustained dialogue among all three groups...." \(^{43}\) Gaddis's archival "data base" concept, however, is vague and unformed. The enormous amount of complex information found in any political story needs to be sorted out and organized before it can become a truly useful "data base." Using the social science rational actor model as a starting point, political life is comprised of six distinct elements. These elements include, the actors themselves, actor assets and liabilities, actor world-view, actor preferences,
actor relationships, and the sort of game and outcome actors realize. The six elements create natural categories from which all research data and variables may be derived.

Working from a near infinite amount of political data on any subject, these six element categories should first be filled in to generate a complete matrix of ideas, sorted by type. After looking at this organization of data, it will be easier to gain a better sense of the big picture of a larger political story. The next step for political researchers would be to select data and variables which they believe are most valuable to their research questions from within this now organized reflection of reality, and then proceed with setting up tests to answer their research questions.

Rational choice theory having roots in utilitarianism philosophy starts with actors seeking to promote happiness or maximize self-interest. Rational choice lends itself to a wide range of epistemological starting points, and, as a result, can be used in descriptive or prescriptive, narrative or quantitative research designs. All but a few researchers can derive some benefit from this kind of event data lay-out. That said, many scholars, weary from the struggles of trying to model political science after the physical science mold, are likely to regard this organizational structure with tired skepticism. Recalling Karl Popper's clouds and clocks metaphor, valid questions arise like whether one organizational schema can really be applied to all political events, and, if so, might this not lead to an ontological


and methodological sameness of approach. Researchers should not feel bound to use the six category organizational structure imposed by this database. Creating and using a single research structure does create the danger of reductionism and homogeneity of approach. Nevertheless, Gaddis's observation that political scientists (let alone anyone outside the field) can hardly understand each other is a serious and valid concern, and one worth working to address. The six category approach is an attempt to accomplish this with a minimum amount of intrusion upon the epistemological and ideological approaches taken by researchers.

The heuristic process of theory-making in political science involves the selection of relevant variables and data from whatever is available. Researchers start their research programs by going only on well-thought-out hunches. Personal bias, interest, and observation are what feed the creative mind of the theorist when asking questions, constructing tests to answer these questions, and choosing data for testing. In the pre-theory stage, no variable is intrinsically more important than another. Only when a variable is applied to particular issues, tests, and experiments can it be demonstrated to have more meaning and relevance than another. Surely, Russian military expenditures are an important variable, but U.S. defense planners have grown equally concerned with the South American drug trade. Both can have a de-stabilizing effect on international

---


47 (Gabriel A. Almond and Stephen J. Genco 1977, 489)

military affairs, but for completely different reasons. Presented with a wider assortment of
variables for study, perhaps the hostility observed by Ted Hopf toward unconventional
perspectives will be lessened as researchers become aware of how much information
outside the mainstream there is to choose from yet, for no good reason, has been
ignored.\textsuperscript{49}

A controlled brainstorming approach can be used to fill in these six categories with
data to generate a thorough picture of a political event. A concerted effort should be
made to come up with as many details as possible to be placed into each appropriate event
category. The deliberate effort of accurately depicting a political event through carefully
listing all conceivable variables, both seemingly relevant and irrelevant, will generate a
clearer picture of the whole political reality then an approach which haphazardly 'ransacks
history' for any relevant data which may happen to be apropos to a research question.\textsuperscript{50}
This organizing effort will require a great deal more work before commencing any serious
research effort. At the same time, however, this organized collection of data may be used
as a depository for the selection of variables for any research on that particular area. An
infinite number of complete variable arrangements can be derived from this structure.
Given a more completely developed organizational background, researchers will more
easily see the overall political landscape.

\textsuperscript{49}(Ted Hopf 1993, 208)
\textsuperscript{50}(John A. Vasquez 1995, 236)
If we wish to stop ignoring the 'bottom rungs' in international relations events, and start asking the 'right' questions, we will need to get as strong an understanding as possible of what is going on in the world. As responsible international relations students, we must be accountable for our decisions on which variables and approaches we choose for our research. Given a more complete picture of an event, when we choose to focus our attention on some variables and not on others, we will become more aware we are doing so. One of the major issues which feminists, Third World theorists, and others have with main-stream international relations researchers is that they sometimes ignore certain issues, while having no knowledge they are even doing so. Selecting specific variables from among a recognized catalog should help educate researchers on their actions.

In order to fill these categories with information derived from an unabridged and haphazard documentation of a world political event, it is worth getting a sense how these categories work and what goes into them. The following is a more in-depth presentation of the six major elements of a political event, what kinds of information goes into them as they function as a data category, and what kinds of relationships they hold to each other and the world.
Part II - Six Categories of a Story

Section 1 - Actor Category

The first task facing researchers is to list all actor variables. Every actor in an event must first be recognized, and then cataloged into the 'Actor' database. The details of their various characteristics, and their relationships to one another may be considered later on. Questions such as how various actors will feel the impact of an international relations event, which actors might have some influence on effecting the outcome of such an event, and who has the greatest capability to influence or control an outcome all require answers which will be addressed as data from the other categories is taken into consideration.

Scholars recognize now that many different actors at many levels can play some role in international relations. Increased communication and awareness among people all over the world has led to greater involvement by a wider range of actors. In the 1980's, increased market demands by U.S. consumers coupled with the profit motivation of Japanese automobile makers and electronics companies almost single-handedly shifted the United States trade balance from a surplus to deficit status. Neither governments nor government elites can the take credit or blame for making this come about. During the famine in Ethiopia in the mid-1980's the U.S. entertainment industry adopted this cause and raised public consciousness along with millions of dollars to support hunger relief organizations. Individual popular musicians became involved, influencing others and
generating support for this cause. The fact is, other powerful U. S. actors besides the United States government were effectively influencing world events and essentially carrying out foreign policy.

In international relations currently, debate continues over the definition of 'actor.' Kenneth Waltz does not dispute that there are other actors besides states in international affairs. He believes, however, that "So long as the major states are the major actors, the structure of international politics is defined in terms of them." The concept, however, of states being the 'major actors' is being challenged more and more by ever more powerful international organizations, corporations, and popular movements. There needs to be a certain set characteristics which political scientists can agree make up the essence of an actor. Many researchers wish to broaden consideration of actors to include such entities. Perhaps a worthwhile starting point in identifying actors would be to start with a broad definition. An actor should be worthy of attention if it can influence or can be influenced by a political event. Since this is a purposely broad data base, there is nothing wrong with including data deemed irrelevant by some but important by others. Those who do not consider non-states as entities need not select such data for their research. Generating a definable list of conceivable actors in political life based on a common definition of who plays a role in political events can be a small first step in developing a common language for political scientists. Debating whether entities such as Mexican farm workers or only


nation states constitute actors in international relations is like debating whether electrons or molecules should be the only things studied in chemistry. Both can play crucial roles, but under different circumstances. Ignoring one or the other makes research efforts more manageable, but may not generate answers that have any bearing on reality.

What exactly does this mean in real life, and why is it important? Creative, unhindered thinking is required to identify all those effected by a particular political event. It is worth remembering the old adage here that, in the great chain of [political] being, everything is connected. Using the example of landmine usage in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War, a reasonable research question might start by asking what caused combatants to choose this particular means of warfare. While reasonable, this question is also extraordinarily complex. There are likely hundreds of actors all playing some role in the deployment of land mines during the war. Understandably, as research progresses on this subject, some actors will be found to play a more influential role than others. In order to start this process, however, such a question needs to be broken down into smaller, more manageable, components which can help researchers better understand what is really involved in this complex issue.

The first step is to ask who is involved. The answer to this question is not simply a list of countries and leaders. A more complete list would begin to include parties such as American, Soviet and Chinese manufacturers of land mines (whose employment roles and economic well-being are directly tied to this weapon's proliferation), foot soldiers on all
sides of the conflict (who were forced to cope daily with the devastating effects of land mines), the families of these soldiers (who have been forced to cope with the challenges of supporting injured or otherwise traumatized veterans), local political and economic leaders in Southeast Asia (who are now forced to figure out how to build a stable society and economy where a large number of individuals have physical disabilities and where the surrounding land is unusable because it is too dangerous to tread), local land owners (whose land assets have become useless because their land can no longer be cultivated, grazed, or lived upon).\footnote{Donovan Webster, "One Leg, One Life at a Time," \textit{The New York Times Magazine}, 23 January 1994, 42.} This list is not nearly complete, but it begins to show how many people really are involved in the issue of land mine usage during the Vietnam war. Such actors are all involved parties either preceding or subsequent to the decision. Some individuals were highly involved in the decision-making process, while others are nearly powerless by-standers, yet all play a role.

In this work feminists, Marxists, and Third World theoreticians who legitimately argue that mainstream theories exclude major segments of the population will finally find a voice in filling in the actor category.\footnote{J. Ann Tickner, "Re-visioning Security," in \textit{International Relations Theory Today}, ed Ken Booth and Steve Smith (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 190.} The actor category of research is only concerned with who is involved. At this point all actors are equal since the only question is whether they exist. Whether actors have any significant ability to influence each other or a game outcome is a concern for research in other categories.
Beginning by asking a more manageable question like, 'who is involved,' is more likely to generate practical information to start a research project, than would forcing ourselves to confront the whole range of issues when we try to address complex questions. How ethnic tensions in Central Europe threaten overall world peace is a question we currently fail to have the capability to adequately address. The question of who is involved, can generate a common organizational scheme and common language which can help organize the way we as political scientists approach a particular story. Once we have come up with answers to such really fundamental questions as 'who,' we can move on to address the other elements which fill in the six category structure. After all that work is done, we can then move on to start asking our real research questions with a better chance of finding answers.

Section 2 - Preference Category

The second requirement involved in understanding any international event consists of discovering the needs and preferences of each actor. In a world without needs, there would be no motivation to do anything. Put another way, without preferences (some might call it greed), no king would ever go to war. The actor preference category deals with what thing or things an actor is trying to accomplish or possess. The rational actor model assumes all actors have preferences which they work to attain, or problems for which they seek solutions. In game theory, a state of dis-equilibrium occurs when a player's preference is strong enough that it is willing to take action to get what it wants. Action taken to obtain a preferred state starts the game. The solution to these problems
are outcomes. For example, the United States government is faced with the problem of assuring an enormous supply of oil to an energy-hungry nation. One solution to this problem involves maintaining influence in an oil-rich region of the world (the Middle East) to assure a constant source of energy to the U.S..

Preferences are actor defined. As an actor identifies shortcomings in its world, it searches for the means by which these shortcomings may be addressed. The decision that life will be better by attaining a certain preferred state is a value judgement made by each actor. How an actor comes to have one preference or interest over another is an area of considerable research in political science. At a certain level, basic human needs must be met, and this will help determine actor preferences. Social and cultural structures also play some role. Beyond that, it is very difficult to be sure what an actor's preferences are in a given situation. Robert Keohane writes that, "self-interest is so elastic." One actor's idea of a better life is rarely the same as another actor's. Some examples of current actor preferences are, independence for Ireland, a secure homeland for Jews, greater access to the Japanese market for American auto-makers, freedom from persecution for European Gypsies, foreign investment capital for Russian businesses.

Actor desires are rarely of equal importance. Actors generally find many things wrong with their world (this seems to be the human condition), but there are usually only


a very small number of these things which are genuinely intolerable and in need of remedy. The famous game of the ‘Prisoner's Dilemma,’ is a dilemma for the simple reason that each prisoner has a range of preferences. Acting on the strongest preference of avoiding a stay in jail altogether can actually have the opposite affect. Acting on the lesser preference of staying for a short period of time (compared to a long period of time) may pay off very well or pay off very poorly. At root, it is the actors’ preferences which drive the game. Israel, for example, is a vulnerable country facing many problems. It faces security concerns being geographically surrounded by hostile neighbors against the Mediterranean Sea. It faces economic concerns being an isolated industrialized nation in a relatively lesser developed region. It faces philosophical concerns being a non-Moslem country in an Islamic region of the world. And, like all countries in the mid-east, Israel must deal with the problem of finding fresh water in a desert environment. In what order does Israel place these priorities when all are crucial to its survival? Stated otherwise, how willing might Israel be to go to war to maintain, for example, a traditional Hebrew way of life, or a secure Jewish homeland, or a stable economy, or enough fresh water to irrigate lawns and wash cars on the West Bank? As social scientists, we can roughly calculate which preferences are most important by measuring how vigorously each is pursued.

To confuse matters further, however, we must also be aware that what an actor may think is important and what its actual measurable behavior reflects may be quite different. Behavioral observations can be misleading since researchers observing an actor see the acted upon choice, which may or may not be what the actor really believes is the
greatest preference (or finest state of affairs).\textsuperscript{57} When considering an actor as large and diverse as the European Union, whose scope of concerns is concomitantly much broader, figuring out a preference hierarchy becomes that much more difficult.

The acted upon preference of an actor will have considerable bearing on its relationship with other actors. When one actor's interest is the same as another actor's, the actors may seek ways of acting in cooperation. Alternatively, if both have a preference for a limited resource, there may be bitter competition for ownership. Different actors may also have multiple mixed preferences which can generate relationships of conflict or cooperation depending upon what is at stake. For example, when the desire is simply chemical weapons control, chemical companies are generally supportive and pronouncements of cooperation common, but when further discussion moves toward the need to fingerprint chemicals, document production procedures, and account for the sale and transfer of exact quantities, these same actors become suspicious corporate foes weary of bureaucratic entanglement and industrial espionage.\textsuperscript{58} Like the proverbial chess game, an actor's action taken to pursue one preference, may or may not hinder or assist the pursuit of another preference. With every move of every actor linked, missteps often occur due to an incomplete understanding of the consequences of each action.

As one actor pursues its interest, the world changes and the effects are felt by


other actors. One actor's self-interest will conflict with another actor's preferences, and a state of dis-equilibrium will arise. For example, a number of industrialized states got together in the 1980's and realized their common desire to limit easy access to chemical materials used to make chemical weapons. The Australia Group of industrialized nations began voluntarily placing controls on the commercial flow of precursor chemicals throughout the world. Since these states produced most of the world's chemicals and served as the major trade source for them, countries needing these chemicals for a number of legitimate reasons had a difficult time getting them.59 While the move to curb chemical sales created a more difficult situation of for those seeking chemicals for weapons purposes, others seeking chemicals for uses such as fertilizer production and manufacturing found it difficult to procure them as well. While one group of countries desires fewer states to have a chemical weapons capacity; another group seeking chemicals for various purposes wants unrestricted trade access to this important industrial resource.

Section 3 - Asset/Liability Category

Assuming a definitive set of actors at work in a particular turn in an international relations game, each actor needs to be examined to assess its particular capabilities. The neostructuralist concern with the "interrelation between policies and their wider socio-economic and ideological domestic and international setting" is not unlike the what is

suggested when filling in the asset/liability category.\textsuperscript{60} Neostructuralism calls for consideration of "transformative processes" at the local, national, and international level.\textsuperscript{61} This being the case, a much more holistic review of actors must take place. This category examines these 'transformative processes' to give life and depth to the actors and their preferences. It is these assets and liabilities which dictate what an actor can or cannot do in any particular international relations game.

As with the definition and identification of actors above, it is worth constructing some definitions of what constitute assets and liabilities. Armed with such definitions, each actor's assets and liabilities may be better identified. Actor assets and liabilities in international relations are the tools or resources an actor uses to influence the outcome of a game. To be clear, the importance of different assets or liabilities to an actor in one turn of a game, may not display the same importance in another game. For example, Iraq has been known to possess chemical weapons since the mid-1970's.\textsuperscript{62} Iraq used chemical weapons against Iran during the Iran/Iraq War. Despite documented widespread use against unprotected populations resulting in hundreds of casualties, this activity never gained significant world attention.\textsuperscript{63} Two years later, however, the mere threat of using


\textsuperscript{61}(Gills & Palen 1994, 7)


this same asset against Israel provoked world-wide condemnation and a rush to support Israel. While amounting to little more than a footnote in history in one situation, Iraq's chemical weapons capability was considered a critically important major world threat in another situation.

The difference between assets and liabilities needs to be made clear. While both play a role in determining the impact an actor may have upon a particular situation, they do so from opposite directions. Put in rational choice terms, an asset aids an actor in maximizing its personal welfare, while a liability minimizes personal welfare. In any game, an actor will look at its liabilities to assess what it needs to do maintain or improve its lot. In simplest terms, from an actor's list of liabilities will arise the preferences which may be perused in a game. If an actor is successful in a game, a pre-game liability can become a post-game asset.

In theory, the concept of assets and liabilities is a straight-forward and important element in determining the course of relations between actors. In reality, however, this likely to be an extraordinarily complex undertaking. For example, one might think that a state's possession of any weapons system would be considered an asset. Certainly, the Soviet Union's procurement of chemical weapons would lead one to assume that they were considered by military planners an asset to be obtained. Times change, however, and this is no longer quite so. What was once an asset, is now a liability. The Soviet Union

---

had a considerable chemical weapons capability, but in comparison to its overall strategic capability, chemical weapons are not that critical. Furthermore, in the current Post-Cold War era where the Russian government is strapped for cash, aging and toxic chemical stockpiles, vulnerable to domestic and international terrorism, human error, and natural calamity, are proving an expensive problem for Russia. In fact, U.S./Soviet negotiations in 1990 on the bilateral destruction of chemical weapons explored the possibility of U.S. funding of Soviet chemical weapons destruction. While at one point such weapons were believed essential to Soviet national security, Russians are confronted with a changed picture of reality. These negotiations illustrate how Russian leaders now view these weapons as a troublesome liability they would be happy to be without.

Once a clear catalog has been generated of each actor's assets and liabilities within an issue area, a ranking needs to be done to weigh different actors' assets against one another. Within this ranking we will discover that some actor assets or liabilities have relevance to a particular issue currently brewing in international affairs while others have almost none. The seemingly minor fact, for example, of who chairs the U.S. Senate Foreign Affairs Committee has had crucial relevance to U.S. financial support for the United Nations. North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms's dislike for international organization, in general, and the United Nations, in particular, has placed a considerable burden on how that organization is able to operate. Despite stated endorsements of the

---

work done by the U. N. by U. S. administration officials, other actors within U. S. national leadership have been able to successfully execute a policy of lack of support. A seemingly minor capability (such as control of a deliberating body's legislative agenda) of a seemingly minor, though well placed, actor may often have disproportionate influence on international affairs.

Section 4 - World-view Category

This part of the international relations puzzle concerns itself with the world view and belief systems held by an actor. This element of the data base is important because it explores an actor's pre-existing mind set which can help to explain why an actor behaves the way it does. The assets and liabilities possessed by an actor only tell part of the story; actor preferences tell another part. The world-view category documents how an actor looks at the world, how it understands the world to operate, and how it views itself and how it views others.

An actor's behavior system is multi-faceted, and which facet is reflected in the actor's behavior depends on a number of complex factors. To illustrate some of the multiple outlooks arising out of a single actor consider the United Nations Conference on Disarmament (CD). As an actor, it takes on certain responsibilities in world affairs, and undertakes certain activities to uphold these responsibilities. Not surprising, each member nation of the Conference comes to the group with a particular world-view and perspective. Participants may come with strongly market-oriented, socialist, nationalist,
regionalist, religious, altruist, or even racist views. Some representatives are highly fearful of war because of their location or minority status, while other are less so. Some states operate within a highly theocratic society, while others more secular. All of these world-views come together in one international organization. The behavior of the body as a whole on a certain decision may reflect one perspective or another, a mix of perspectives, or a perspective unique to the CD. Certainly, however, as an organization charged with promoting international peace, a pacific outlook by representatives is generally the prominent world view expressed.\(^6\)

Some well known examples of actor world-views may be seen in realist and idealist theories. Realism and Idealism are conceptions of reality which help guide behavior. Perceptions such as those generated through realist or idealist thinking can help to determine actor preferences and behavior. For example, looking at the events leading to World War I, an unexpected change in Russian world-view played a major role in the onset of the war. In 1908, Austria annexed the Turkish province of Bosnia. Serbia reacted to this and sought support from Russia. When Germany came to the side of Austria, Russia backed down from supporting Serbia. At this point, Russia was feeling insecure having recently lost the war in the East in 1905, and having no other allies. When in 1914 Germany came to the side of Austria-Hungary, Germany believed that Russia would, again, back down from supporting Serbia. This time, Russia having recovered

\(^6\)Different states' views on the divisive issue of chemical weapons control may be observed to contrast, yet, converge to support the 1992 Chemical Weapons Convention. See articles by Hassan Mashhadi, Prekash Shah, Adolph Ritter von Wagner, and Ameka A. Azikiwe in *Disarmament: A Periodic Review by the United Nations* VOL. 16, NO. 1 (1993).
from the war in 1905 and having France as an ally, did not. Changes in Russia's assets,
engendered greater feelings of empowerment on the part of Russia. This shift in Russia's
world view from lesser power to greater power brought about a change in Russian foreign
policy. Germany's failure to anticipate this change in Russian thinking is one important
cause leading to the outbreak of World War I.⁶⁷

Section 5 - Game Category

The game category seeks to model how a set of actors are arranged how they
relate to each other across the international relations landscape. From modeling, an
understanding is sought on the strategies used by actors to pursue their preferences. If
actors have been identified, their preferences identified, their assents and liabilities
cataloged, and their world-views understood, the next thing to consider in an event data
base is how all these complex actors come together to interact with one another. This
category involves using mathematically-derived game theory to construct a simplified form
of reality from which researchers can more easily understand what is going on.

In a particular turn of a game, there will be two or more actors, each with
different, conflicting preferences. One actor will want one thing, while another actor will
want another. Game theoreticians have outlined a number of models which recreate how
a set of actors will relate to one another. By assessing the degree of risk and the size of
payoff an actor is willing to take to pursue a particular outcome, one can figure out

---

possible outcomes and the likelihood of such outcomes in a given game. Looking at such things as the likelihood of success in achieving the most desired outcome over another lesser desired outcome, the degree of risk involved when using a particular strategy, the importance to an actor in attaining one outcome over another, the possibility that another outcome might be equally acceptable, the amount of information an actor has about the other and about what will happen under certain circumstances, as well as the prospects of cooperation between actors can help researchers both explain and predict events.

Consider the example of the government of Iraq's quest to develop a chemical warfare capability. When studying two among many possible individual actors, one may need to look at many difficult issues to construct a model between only two players. If the actors being observed are the German chemical industry and the Iraqi Ministry of Agriculture, how are the two actors put together in a game? Which actor possessing which assets or liabilities is most able to pursue its goals under given circumstances, and how does it do so? Are the vast technological, material, and intellectual resources of the German chemical industry a relevant asset when seeking to control the flow of precursor chemicals around the world? Are the Iraqi agriculture ministry's knowledge of complex chemical trade issues and its strong government-wide support sufficient assets to help Iraq procure chemical materials to build a potent chemical weapons arsenal? These two

---

distantly related actors have different preferences and different capabilities. It is not at all
easy to compare these two actors; it is not even easy to see the relationship between the
them. German chemical industry, while motivated primarily by profit, is within a major
Western industrialized state actively concerned with chemical weapons proliferation. The
Iraqi agriculture ministry, on the other hand, closely connected to the Sadam Hussein’s
military, has played an important role in the acquisition of chemicals to be used in chemical
weapons. In fact, these two actors have had significant interaction in the past for both
legitimate agricultural purposes as well as for other more questionable purposes. Here is
where a simplified model can play a helpful role. The goal of research in the area of the
game category is to identify the kinds of relationships that exist, and assess their meaning.
With careful construction only the most germane pieces of information are made part of
the model to help figure out what sorts of moves each player is likely to make.

The power of game theory to explain political life has made it one of the more
promising fields in political science. Game theory modeling enables researchers to focus
on how actors come by strategies which determine the actor's behavior. Using the Game
category part of the data base, researchers can better understand the probabilities of
outcomes and sometimes even predict outcomes. Its use, however, is dependent upon an
advanced understanding of the entire political scene which is why understanding actors,
their preferences, and their assets and liabilities is most helpful from the start.

---

John J. Fialka, "Fighting Dirty: Western Industry Sells Third World Means To Produce Poison Gas," Wall Street
Journal, 16 March 1988, 1(A) and 22(A).
Section 6 - Outcome Category

The outcome to a game for an actor should, with luck, reflect the original preference of the actor. This outcome is the result of an actor's efforts toward maximizing its self-interest. In a perfect world, each actor's preferences would eventually become the game outcome. In reality, of course, since there are always at least two players, and since so many games are zero-sum (meaning only one player can win) actors will often fail to succeed and achieve their preferences. Remember that the image of a possible new world order which Adolf Hitler envisioned before he set out for the conquest of Europe was radically different from the reality he faced in April of 1945.

The outcome category is a listing of potential states of reality after the different actors in a game have taken their respective turns. Since there are many possible turns one player can take in any game, even in a single turn game, let alone an iterated (repeated) game, many possible outcomes exist. In international relations, every game is essentially iterated since there is always some kind of response to every move a particular player makes. The world's players rarely ever go away but must wake up the next day to face each other all over again. As a result, the number of outcomes, in the long run, can be considerable. As in a chess game, the more potential outcomes there are to a game, the more consideration regarding what moves should be made is necessary. With a list of potential outcomes, will come a similar ordered range of desired outcomes as well.

---

70 (Robert Axelrod 1984, 12)
Part III - Conclusion

The six category structuring system for political events data addresses three major problems facing political researchers. First, it helps foster the development of common ways of thinking about political events. Second, it helps increase recognition for all kinds of variables large and small. Third, it helps researchers see a larger picture of a political issue, wherein this fuller knowledge can help them construct better experiments and theories. These are briefly discussed below.

Common Ways of Thinking

The six category matrix allows a plurality of thinking regarding philosophical outlook, and methodological approach. Looking at political life through an organization of six categories provides a common library of data to test and study. This organization will force some to acknowledge some phenomena, if only to reject them. Debate regarding the nature of variables will arise, but it will center on composition and relevance rather than its very existence. Those who are trying to explain or predict world events in a purely empirical sense can use the six categories, and those who build theory hoping to change behavior around the world in a normative, prescriptive sense can benefit as well. A broad range of different philosophical outlooks may accommodated as well. Realist, idealists, feminists, Marxists, and others are epistemologically accommodated with this structure, because depending on the interest of each, the focus of their research can proceed in any chosen direction after using the data ordering of the six categories as a
starting point. The six categories do not place a value on a given variable. The researcher can select or reject a variable depending upon his or her perceived value of a variable or his or her interest in or experience with a research variable.

While this structure provides an order to the otherwise jumbled data of real life, those who do use it do face some risk. On the one hand, this is good for political science which suffers from many schools of thought who are unable to communicate with one another. On the other hand, this is bad because using a common rational epidemiological outlook precludes other epistemologies. A common source of data which promotes a common starting point and some commonality of language may be seen as reductionist. At a very theoretical level, some researchers may bridle at this ontological monism. When this is the case, researchers should not feel bound to the six category way of thinking. It can assist in helping develop a common language of political science, but no one likes being forced to speak a language foreign to them.

Equalize Actors in Political Life

The thousands of variables at work in any international relations issue can no longer continue to go unrecognized and ignored; we must learn to acknowledge and deal with them in one way or another. Using the six category system, when a researcher selects certain variables at the start of a research project, he or she will be forced to be more consciousous because he or she will be forced to face the whole range of variables in a particular category in order to select the ones on which he or she wants to do research.
Without any structure for ordering data, a researcher only has to pick any variable at hand and not be obliged to acknowledge the whole range of existent variables. A more conscious and considered process for selecting variables and data to test and study forces researchers to think harder every step of the way. Poor data selection, means poor research results. Poor data selection also means researchers are more open to criticism by others eager to point out selection bias.

In this age of Post-Positive heightened sensitivity to more political actors and details, using a structure which draws out political data from all sources in a non-judgmental fashion will lend more credibility to people and their problems often minimized or ignored in the past. As merely possible items for research and exploration on a long list, no variable is more important than another. Relevance is demonstrated when testing proves that a variable's presence causes something to happen, or that it has some kind of definable relationship to something else. Alone, with no referents, one piece of data is the same as another. What this means for woman, minorities, Third World actors, and others is that they are able to take a seat beside major corporations, super-power nations, and world leaders. Whether these different variables have the same impact on world events, and whether they can play similar roles is unlikely, but they are less likely to be forgotten. If we accept the notion that Micronesian islanders are an actor in the global warming debate, we must come to respect their assets and liabilities, preferences, and the game they will play in this realm. There may be little they can do to impact events, but they are there, and they do have a role. Cynthia Enloe writes, "It is only by delving deeper into any
political system, listening more attentively at its margins, that one can accurately estimate the powers it has taken to provide the state with the apparent stability that has permitted its elite to presume to speak on behalf of a coherent whole.71 The problem rests in figuring out a way to hear these margins over the clamor of the center. Taking the time to painstakingly list all the different voices across the spectrum can help.

Many variables are truly irrelevant, but this will never be known if we fail to even recognize their existence. Currently, the only way to find out the importance of different data in political science is to actually use it in research and find out by trial and error if it is relevant or not. This can be accomplished in a more organized fashion if the variables and data are themselves organized. Checking through an ordered list to find out which variables play a role in generating a particular outcome in a political event makes more sense than simply testing whatever comes up that seems to make sense in no particular order.

Better Overall Picture

Stepping back and looking at this huge database, the dominance of one philosophical or political outlook will be much more difficult because we will be forced to recognize the immensely broad range of actors, assets and liabilities, preferences, world views, and possible games played in the world. The clear involvement of all levels of analysis will challenge the ways staunch realists look at the world. Alternatively, looking

71(Enloe 1996, 200)
at the undeniably strong hand which large state actors have in shaping world events will challenge those who say more focus should be placed elsewhere. Creating a means by which researchers can all get this broad view of the world should help them have a better sense of where they and their research fit in.

Most importantly, researchers on their way to selecting variables and phenomena on which to conduct research will be forced to recognize the existence of a richer, more diverse, political world than that to which they are accustomed. This observation must surely influence variable selection, experiment design, and theory construction. Laying out the entire U.S./Soviet Cold War relationship would necessarily include data on the role played by, and the experience of, ordinary Russian and American citizens. Perhaps observations would have been made which would have given some warning about future events within the Soviet Union. The goal is to avoid being blind to the political turmoil under our noses as we stare out to space looking for the dangers beyond.
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