

War Game 2

Individual Reflection

Power is something everyone is craving for, yet one does not realize how much responsibility comes with it. I can say that I came to realization of how much trouble being powerful is when I appeared in the USA team for the second war game. Preparation process was not intense due to the busy schedule the dialogue had, but we still managed to come up with several interesting ideas while working on our slideshow. My personal favorite was the initiative to suggest using the safe GMOs for feeding the populations of 1.2 billion. It makes sense to me in terms of the Condorcet statistics, that living supplies grow with arithmetical progress, while the populations grows with geometrical. Before the game started, we were expecting the other teams to appreciate our ideas and the negotiations to be peaceful and easy-agreement-style ones. But we were soooo wrong!

After the game, when Dr. Iacono offered us to think about the moment when we felt uncomfortable, I could not decide which part of the war game to choose, because I felt uncomfortable all the time! Starting from the point where we got attacked because of the Emission Per GDP idea, which was not our ultimate decision for the emission limitation. We clearly explained that we were not suggesting it as an only model. However, every team and even the moderator tried to emphasize only that particular idea. Consequently, during the negotiations I was pretty impressed about how many times we had to explain that emission per GDP was not the only offer we had. I don't quite agree with the emissions per GDP model and understood the people's concern. For my benefit,

I gained a valuable experience on how to be a negotiator for the topics you personally might consider controversial.

As in the case of first war game, I was totally surprised to discover how much good the dialogue and this format of decision-making can bring. I would like to see war game format actually being used during G7 and other international meetings of global importance. Professor Ganguly should start thinking about it! Continuing on G7, I would like to say that we were the only developed/G7 representative country, which caused us a big trouble. SAARC (except India, as represented during the War Game 2), India and China tried to put on us the blame for all the faults of other developed nations, which was not fair. But as Bill Gates likes to mention: “Hey, life is NOT fair.”

Personally I, like the controversy with the nuclear power usage during the first war game, did not want to pursue the idea of Emission limit per GDP model. However, until the very end I was protecting the team interests during our negotiations. If I were to decide, I would make US be in the role of a “king, grand philanthropist”, which would put a good amount of funds for the sustainable development of the developing nations. I really wanted the UN team to cover the UN Conference of 2014 June 1992 regarding the environment protection, during which Rio Declaration on Environment and Development was established. As the US team, we would be glad to cooperate about meeting the requirements of Rio Declaration, which would have a huge impact on the tomorrow’s environmental justice.

To sum up, there were topics that we did not manage to cover and topics we did not cover well, but given the amount of time and the access to Internet we had for the game preparations, I think we still did a good job. At least, we managed to realize that the

USA has a major role and financial potential to invest in SAARC nations, including India and help them to be provided with renewable energy resources and clean water. Also, we can help to establish a better healthcare system. Besides, for successful negotiations, I would support the idea of emission limit per capita. At least, until the point where India and China, both have an opportunity to cut on emissions without stopping the development of the nations. At this point, I believe, India is at the stage of French Revolution philosophy change, where it transformed the *Subject* into *Citizen*. This is why I think that the great emphasis should be put onto health care, clean water access, women's rights, child labor control, informal economic sector, common human rights problems and sustainable development in general, rather than forcing the country to cut on emissions right away. From China the goodwill to cooperate will be greatly appreciated, as well as from UN the efforts to actually control the ongoing political processes throughout the world. For SAARC, we came to a conclusion that US will continue sending the aid and will eventually start increasing the funds.

One final thought – I want to be a moderator for a war games somehow.

May be – NEXT SUMMER?