

CIV4778

June 21, 2015

Dr. Auroop Ganguly

Pedro Falcon

### **War Game #2 Reflection**

The second war game was significantly harder than the first one in almost every possible way. This time, instead of hoping to achieve the goals of my sector, I had to look out for the needs of my country. This sounds like an easy task, however, it also means that I had to take into consideration the history of my country, its diplomatic relationships with other nations, its culture, its political stands and its goals in the future.

It was clear how at the beginning of the war game, during the first presentations, our team lacked of confidence and failed to assume our role as China – a growing nation in dispute with many others. One of the first mistakes we made was to say that Tibet “was open to discussion” when in fact, China believes it is not. Similarly, we repeatedly said that some of our research and data might not be accurate since it comes from our government when other teams asked us to corroborate it, when in fact we should have said that the information provided by our government is completely accurate and reliable. After the presentations I was disappointed, I was unhappy with some of the ways that our slides were presented and with the questions that were asked to my team. I was prepared to answer questions regarding the emissions of my country and the scarcity of water in northern China, however, the questions were focused towards literacy and gender equality. This annoyed me a little; most of the teams had talked about China’s emissions and blamed us to be one of the biggest contributors to climate change in

their presentations and yet, they decided to focus on other topics when they were given the chance to ask.

During lunch, I expressed my thoughts to my team. I told them that we needed to assume more our role as China, thus we had to focus more on issues about greenhouse gas emissions than on gender equality and affirmative action. Although they took into consideration my worries, they still preferred to propose policies in which China would invest in other countries' education and fight gender inequality. Additionally, they decided that making the U.S pay back the money they owed us was a priority. I did not particularly agree with this policy, but I decided to not say anything because I knew that I had to sacrifice some things. However, what I did not agree with at all was our offer to give 5% of the money the US owed us back to them, this accounted for more than \$60 billion USD and I knew that China would never just give its money away, and especially not to the US.

Ironically, this time my team also ended up debating about dams. During our research, we learned that China is building dams in the Brahmaputra River and we decided to take this project into the debate. We knew that it was going to be received with disapproval from every other team, which in a way made me happy because we were finally going to be the bullies in the debate, so I decided to investigate more about this project.

Following lunch, we negotiated with other teams some of our policies. As a details expert on the dams I knew that I had to know everything there is to know because other countries like India and SAARC were going to argue against the project. I was particularly excited to play this role and defend something I would not personally advocate for.

I discovered that even though something may seem like an evil project, if it is presented correctly it can be hard to argue against it. For the dams, I found the UN convention on

Transboundary Watercourses of 1997 and used it in China's favor as well as the fact that with the dams China will be able to supply water to more than 100 million citizens and produce 5.6% percent of its electricity from a clean source.

I believe that this is what I learned the most from these war games – anything can sound good as long as you present it from the right angle. I am glad that I was part of China's team in the second war game, it definitely made things more challenging for me but it also made it all more interesting. Not only did I learn how to defend projects I don't particularly agree with, or about the process of communication and policy making, but about China itself. During my research, I was surprised by the significant actions that China has taken to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions given its bad reputation and the well-known fact that it is the country with the highest emissions in the world. This makes me wonder if I see China as the bad guy only because I am part of the West and because all I read about this country comes from Western sources. Maybe, as I just said, it's all about the angle that is chosen to present the data from; is it possible that I have not been able to look beyond the bias in the news I read in Boston about China? If something is true it is that this Dialogue certainly helped me have a broader perspective and better understanding of the world, for the first time in my life small things like the news I read online are from different sources and criticize countries and people in a different way than Western news would do. From the people I see, to the places I visit to the classes I take in India, I have been able to learn about climate change, policy making and expand my vision of the world.