

## Jake Messner Individual Reflection

### War Game 2

#### United States of America

June 25, 2015

The second war game gradually proved that I was again on the team that the mass mentality believed to be evil: the United States of America. As the only developed country and the only G7 country in the war game negotiation, the United States was looked upon to be the primary provider of funds and resources to a plethora of developing nations including China and all eight SAARC countries. This position again put me into a team that would be dependent on defending its actions against the scrutiny of the rest of the teams. While the UN team technically encompassed our team, many of their policies were designed to support poorer UN nations and were therefore not in our best interests.

As we developed our presentation, we believed that a major focus of the second war game would be a push for some kind of international emissions cap. In order to address this focus, we determined how we would want such a cap to be established. As a country with only about a quarter of the populations of China and India but with 1.7 times the gross domestic product (GDP), a per capita carbon cap would be detrimental to the United States' economy. In order to encompass the needs of very populous countries, of very small countries, and of developed countries, we decided to side with the Millennium Development Goal number 7, as established at the 2000 millennium meeting of the UN: to regulate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in total, per capita, and per \$1 GDP.

By subtly mentioning each component of this carbon cap, we believed our formula, once weighted through negotiations, could be molded to satisfy each entity in the think tank. After thorough negotiations, we determined with the other negotiators that there was no way to establish

a strict carbon cap that was agreed upon by every entity. Looking back on this goal, it was not a realistic initiative to suggest and fight for, one that should have been initially eliminated.

As the only developed nation, we then turned our focus towards aiding developing nations in implementing development practices and initiatives such that they could grow their efficiencies as developing countries and the world could then work together to practice sustainability. This was a critical component of the negotiation, since China and all eight SAARC countries had agenda points to request foreign investment from the United States.

In our discussions with China, their team offered a plan in which five percent of America's debt to China, amounting to 63.5 billion USD, would be forgiven if the United States invested this money in renewable energy technology domestically. Seeing no downside to this initiative, we immediately approved it and added it to our modified agenda presentation. In what I believe was in the style of an actual international think tank, China later took back this initiative and denied earlier proposing it. Our team was quite disappointed, though there was little we could do to prove the proposal of the original initiative.

As the final presenter, I was responsible for creating the presentation containing our updated agenda and the ways in which we intended to collaborate with other negotiators. As the presentations and later negotiations progressed, it became apparent we would need to offer significant aid, both financially and in resources, to aid the developing nations in the negotiation. We offered this in our final presentation through humanitarian aid and increased foreign direct investment. We offered to open dialogues regarding several contested issues including investments from other G7 countries, an international carbon cap, and debt repayment to China. In addition to foreign initiatives, we agreed to implement domestic plans to tax carbon emissions, limit HFCs, and tax fossil fuels. Overall, this seemed an acceptable consensus to come to as the primary

financier in the negotiation. Though developing nations were unable to approve some of our proposed initiatives, we were happy to be able to help facilitate a dialogue that led to world towards greater sustainability, especially in developing countries.

Marita and I not being able to make the meeting two nights before the war game meant that we had to work especially hard three nights before and one night before the war game. My slides were prepared well in advance, although my team started doubting the alignment of our initiatives with the beliefs of the United States on the final day before negotiations. For us, this meant that we redesigned many of our slides and woke up at five the morning of the war game to complete our modifications.

The second war game was overall more difficult than the first because the countries negotiation had more distinctly different priorities than the five sectors that had been negotiating in the first war game. Rather than being able to come to agreements among all negotiating entities, it was easier to agree with a single additional entity. While this was representative of a real world scenario, it created an end result filled with partially ratified initiatives. Though few agreements were universal, the negotiations served to improve policies promoting climate resilience around the world and particularly in south Asia.