

Rachna Igwe

June 23, 2015

Professor Ganguly

War Game 2 Individual Reflection

Walking into the hotel room, my group members had anxious feelings on their faces. Due to a trip another group member and I had journeyed on, we had not been able to help much with putting together the PowerPoint. It was the night before the war game and half the PowerPoint was not finished. Due to the lack of internet, our group had a lot to do last minute. Finishing up the slides and decorating the slides all in one night, the PowerPoint looked polished and ready by two in the morning. Although it was finished last minute, the slides were precise and completed. As the technical leader, I had made sure to follow Dr. Iacono's advice about how slide presentation should look. I decided to limit the amount of text, add many interesting images, and add a table of contents to help the viewer follow along. This advice helped us keep our presentation concise. Moreover, not only did it create an exact agenda for the listeners, it added a way for our group to organize the slides in an effective order.

The morning before the presentation, our team gathered for breakfast. Sydney Hubbell was the presenter for our team SAARC. She was feeling anxious but as she practiced in front of me over and over again, she became very comfortable with presenting without her notes. She ended up presenting first. In our presentation, we discussed how SAARC was a group of small nations in Southern Asia that were extremely vulnerable to climate change. These nations are all economically unstable and many have troubled political systems. In addition, these nations are some of the most densely populated nations in the world and were still in critical development phases in their histories. Although many of them have huge populations, their emissions are

minimal due to the fact that their economies are not yet developed. Comparing their population to that of larger nations like the United States, graphs showed how radically different the energy consumption between nations were. This difference led my team to propose many ideas that would help target climate change worldwide. These included creating a cap and trade program on the basis of per capita, having nations sign the Bali Action Plan which used the basics used in the Cancun agreements. These were agreements were one that promised a reduction in emissions, but, although most nations had signed the plan, they had not yet written or submitted mitigation proposals. The final goal was to gain regional support from India and China for water and energy sharing agreements. A major problem that we ran into when creating these goals was the fact that all the countries were very different, whether it was their history with the surrounding states, their location, or their internal issues. An example is how India and Pakistan are not on good terms while the other states are relatively “close” to India. These goals tried to incorporate all the problems of each countries.

During negotiations, many of these goals were able to be met. India, due to the fact that they were part of SAARC, tended to agree with most of the policies that we wanted. In fact, during team on team negotiations, we got our way with all of our policies, mostly only running into trouble with the United Stated on the cap and trade per capita issue. As these individual team negotiations wound down, we, as SAARC, felt pretty confident that we would be getting many of our policies.

During the next section of the games, we presented our new proposals which tended to consist of the same demands as the beginning. This part seemed to go quickly and the war games seemed to be going reasonably peacefully. In the next step of the process, the debates started to pick up heat. Many of the agreements decided during the individual negotiations were taken back

due to the fact that China and the United States were very argumentative. The United States refuted the idea of a cap and trade program on a per capita basis, while China refused to give up demands for water sharing agreements. These arguments were tied to many parts of each team proposals and, therefore, by the end of the hour, many of the agreements were debatable and therefore tabled.

This showed how real politic worked. The role of the stakeholder seemed to take a huge role in this war game. Due to the fact that sometimes a team would not play their countries role correctly, the stakeholder constantly reminded them to accurately play their roles even if it contradicted their morals. This really showed how countries were very selfish and how they always had to benefit in some way in order for any agreement to work out. It was sad to think about how the world would probably never agree on policies about climate change until something disastrous occurred like the complete loss of the Maldives.

During the reflection period with Dr. Iacono, we discovered how important communication was. Due to the fact that communication seemed to bring a loss of information between multiple people, the emphasis on retaining accurate information was important. In some cases during the exercise, people were not completely portrayed correctly due to different intonations in their voice. This just emphasized how listening to a constituency was difficult due to the fact that every person is so different and has ideas that many not mesh into a perfect package with a neat bow.

In conclusion, this war game was very messy, agreements wise, compared to the last war game. Each country was at a different stage in their development which meant that they all had different demands. Due to this, no finite agreement could come about. This showed how, in real politics in terms of climate change, countries can rarely come up with policy that is affective. In

order for countries to approve, many times the policies have to benefit all parties which rarely happens. In the end, no policies are reached or the policies are vague and not substantial.