

Rose Leopold

CIVE 4778

22 June 2015

War Game 2 – Individual Reflection

During the second war game, I represented climate change and energy policy for the United Nations. I really enjoyed this role because it allowed me to delve deeper into international policy and protocol, which is something that I will need to know and understand if I want to pursue a career as a diplomat. I find the United Nations (UN) to be a fascinating international body because it has virtually universal membership from nations across the globe. Even with this almost universal membership from countries that have many opposing viewpoints on a wide range of issues, the UN is able to usually come to a consensus on topics and receives wide support from the global society. However, within the context of the war game, I felt that the other groups did not fully understand the role of the UN nor did they fully understand what the UN was or was not capable of doing. This was the basis of my frustration for the entire war game because I felt as though many people did not fully understand the stance they were presenting for their country or region. However, I did enjoy this war game more than the last one because international policy and negotiations are much more in line with my area of study than the last war game.

Individually, I really enjoyed the topic and organization to which I was assigned. I was able to present my best work by representing the United Nations. However, I would have liked to be on the United States team because in reality, I will one day have to represent the United States in negotiations with other countries, not the United Nations. Having this war game focus on South Asia presented an interesting twist to negotiations, especially for the UN, because it almost

seemed as though we, as the United Nations, were forgetting other parts of the world that would be impacted by climate change as well. Nonetheless, I learned even more about why South Asia is so vulnerable to climate change and it made me want to serve in one of the SAARC countries during one of my first posts as a diplomat so that I can share the knowledge I have learned throughout this dialogue to create real policy or compromise with these nations in the hopes to better prepare them and the US in our combined response to the impact of climate change.

I believe my team worked fairly well together. However, I became very frustrated with some of the members as the war game went on and they were not able to understand the need for compromise or why the UN would be supportive of certain policies. I understand that many of the topics discussed at the war game such as GDP, per capita, international protocols, etc, were new to many people, however, in my mind that does not give them a reason to become stubborn and steadfast in the point of view their limited research presented. The war game should be a time to expand all of our knowledge on topics with which we are not intimately familiar, instead of keeping our minds closed to the viewpoints others can bring to the table.

Even though we had limited Internet access and many health problems within our team, most of us were still able to get our parts of the presentation done by the agreed to date. It became very trying when certain members failed to be ready to share their slides and information even when the rest of us were able to be ready despite the above-mentioned issues. Overall, we were able to put together a good presentation and I was very pleased with my presentation during the actual war game.

In terms of the war game overall, I believe this one flowed much better and was more successful than the last one. Even though less was agreed to by all nations, I felt the process of negotiations and discussions was more in line with how real negotiations should be. Again, I

took issue with a lack of compromise by some sectors even when new proposals had the ability to give them everything they wanted in addition to benefiting another sector. I also became frustrated with the way the nations were divided. While I understand why India and SAARC were split up, I believe negotiations could have been more smooth and successful if they had been combined, as they are in the real world. Along similar lines, I found it very strange to exclude the European Union (EU) and other G7 countries from negotiations and the entire war game. The EU and other G7 nations invest heavily in South Asia on the issues we were discussing and in the real world, they would not be left out in the way they were during our war game. If this war game was to be repeated, I would suggest splitting the teams up in the following ways: United Nations, China, SAARC (with a focus on India specifically), United States (representing the entire G7), and the European Union. I understand that with a small group, like we have on this dialogue, perfect representation of the world powers will never be possible, but I think it could be more even than it was in our war game.

Overall, I again found the war game to be a valuable piece of reflection on international negotiations and once again reinforced my want to pursue diplomacy and negotiations in my future career.