

Joyce Schmulson

Reflection for War Game 2

June 25, 2015

Having the first War Game under my belt, I felt that it would be easier to approach the final War Game. I assumed the role of being a representative for India, where I focused on the non-elite society and the developing economy. When I first looked at my part, I was excited because I am intrigued by socioeconomic topics. However, looking at my position again from a climate perspective proposed a challenge.

My initial research began with education in India. Like the first War Game, I quickly fell under the impression that not all of the issues that needed obvious attention and mitigation would receive solutions. I learned how difficult it is to combat an informal sector when it is so heavily engrained in Indian society. However, I personally feel that overtime, the sectors have a potential to merge, with proper incorporation of education. Given the size of the population in India, this again, does not seem like an easy feat. My personal ventures also led me to realize how developing nations are disproportionately effected by climate change, especially compared to other developed countries and their resilience.

During the War Game, we heard the goals and woes of each section, including SAARC, the U.S., the U.N., and China. I was initially confused by some presentations and their initiatives. My team demonstrated strength in knowing what foreign countries were actually trying to do. In knowing this, I acquired knowledge regarding how to understand the cost/benefit analysis in projects that other nations want to implement in India. There seemed to be more stipulations than met the eye in previous projects. For instance, there is a gap between the emissions actually produced in India by foreign companies and by domestic companies. There is a highway constructed by China, which was initially said to cause minimal destruction, but in reality, heavily effected Indian society.

Throughout the entire facilitation I learned what a “cap and trade” was, and how it could be implemented. In the U.S., a cap and trade was implemented in a region of California. I personally feel that it would be too difficult to acquire internationally, as most populations are not homogeneous. This became a major part of the entire War Game, as it came into fruition. I was unclear as to which ways you could look at emissions and how you could allocate the amount to each country. I was concerned that the discussion did not really touch on climate change and its severity. The main facet that was contested was the carbon emissions cap, which I felt did not need to be negotiated so heavily, that other areas of discussion were barely touched upon.

I personally felt that our discussion was not a good indicator of how well we knew our respective sectors because we did not have a proper amount of research regarding the varying topics of contention brought up by different teams. I also was not sure how plausible some of the propositions were in the context of real life policy amendment.

I still hold it to be true that educating the mass would be an integral part of maintaining and instigating sustainability in India. However, I recognize that there is a need for severe improvement and agreement amongst different sections in order for progress to be unhindered. This statement was proved to me when we did our final reflection, led by Dr. Iacono. She reminded us that being uncomfortable with a topic was a sign that you were learning something new. Her activity also depicted how our War Game modeled how policy making works on a scalar level. It demonstrated that representatives can misconstrue their constituents, to the point where the people's voices become murmurs.

6/25/15 11:20 PM

6/25/15 11:20 PM