

Congtin Nguyen

Professor Ganguly

CIVE 4778

25 June 2015

War Game 2 Individual Reflection

For the second war game, I was assigned to be a part of Team India. I was excited about this because as we are currently studying in India, the negotiations have always tended to revolve around India in a manner of speaking, just because of the fact of the matter. At the same time, I was apprehensive to assume the role of an Indian representative because I didn't know if I would be able to accurately represent the interests of the country we had been touring for the past month.

When approaching preparations for the war game, I, along with most of the other students on the Dialogue, was confused about what the objectives all five teams would be working for in this case. Would it be the same idea as the first war game, attempting to formulate a formal policy for India to adopt to mitigate climate change? The two war games were different in that the first one focused solely on India, splitting our Dialogue group up into five teams categorized as five different sectors in India, whereas the second war game would be on a slightly more global scale, with the five teams being India, the United States, the United Nations, China, and SAARC. The scope was much bigger, and involved big powers attempting to agree on a collective solution to the worsening climate problem.

Having already participated in the first war game as part of the Industry team looking at India, I confess that I came in with a skewed view of the types of policies India as a whole nation rather than specific sectors should adopt. I was more inclined to advocate a similar set of

demands from the Indian government that the Industry team had asked for during the first war game.

One of the most focal points in our demands was that India not be subjected to a substantial cap on emissions in order to allow it to develop to the level of Western countries before being mandated to curb emissions. It was interesting to think that some of the other members on the India team had been vehemently opposed to Industry's demands in the first war game, but now agreed with and supported the same ideas against which they had previously fought.

Another one of the more contentious facets of this second war game was the method by which we would cap emissions. Though I roughly understood what capping per capita meant, the notion of cap per GDP was slightly perplexing to me and as such, I just went with what the more educated members of my team said was best for India, meaning eschewing the idea of cap per GDP proposed by the United States.

It was interesting to consider SAARC as its own separate entity independent of India, because in actuality, India is a major player and member of SAARC. Though the SAARC team managed to establish a relatively separate stance on what it wanted from the war game negotiations, they were more or less aligned with India on all counts given the developing nature of both parties.

Overall, this war game seemed a lot easier to follow in that it involved countries and international bodies of which I had a lot more knowledge. While the first war game was limited in scope to India, a country which I do not think most of us know about extensively, I at least felt more familiar with discussions on the US and the UN and arguing on behalf of India to effect change on a global scale. It was still incredibly interesting to see teams clash on certain subjects

and to observe the willfulness with which we would argue for policies that we had often come up on our own based off select readings and research. A prime example of this during the war game was the controversial damming of the Brahmaputra River. Team China was adamant that we as a collective group approve the damming of the river to bring water to northern China, despite the fact that it would deprive Eastern Indian citizens of this crucial resource. Team India was obstinate in its rejection of the dams, and China acted similarly, even inserting its agreement to other terms as contingent on the dam's construction. As such, that part of the policy we passed remained uncertain, highlighted in red. Nevertheless, I think it speaks to the degree to which we were willing to immerse ourselves in our roles such that we could almost mirror the inefficacy of real-life governing bodies. The war game was notably distinct from the first war game, and I found it fascinating to work to hypothetically solve climate change in such a novel way. However, it has taught me that I am not cut out to be a diplomat or a career negotiator; I would much rather be experimenting scientifically new methods and trying to better study and understand the climate problem in order to find a solution to it.