

Political Science 225: The United Nations System

Dr. Kille - Final Exam Take Home Paper for Spring 2008

The take home portion of the final exam is an evaluative paper that provides students the opportunity to analyze their United Nations simulation experience. The paper counts for 10% of the total grade for the course. Papers should be a minimum of 5 pages in length. The related material to support the paper from Smith's book *Politics and Process at the United Nations* **must** be clearly referenced.

The papers must be turned in by the final exam Wednesday May 7 at 7:00pm. Since this is the normal final exam time scheduled for the course **late papers will NOT be accepted** and it will be treated as if the student missed this part of the final exam if they do not turn in a paper on time. Papers turned in by 2:00pm on Friday May 2 will be graded and returned at the in-class portion of the final exam.

Topics that must be addressed in the paper: (the exact order and approach for writing about these topics is left to the student, but all of the topics must be clearly covered)

* Given the goals that you set out in your simulation preparation position paper, to what degree were you able to get your country's interests met? Be sure to provide details from both issues addressed during the simulation. What allowed you to meet the goals of your country and what impeded you from meeting the goals?

* What strategies did you try? What strategies worked and why? What strategies did not seem to work and why? In hindsight, what would you do differently if you knew then what you know now? Be sure to link this discussion to Smith's coverage of three categories of strategies of influence in Chapter 9.

* How did you find working within the confines of the rules of procedure? What rules worked the best? What rules do you feel impeded the negotiation process? What changes would you make to improve these rules? Overall, do you feel that such diplomatic procedures are necessary for UN negotiations or do they hinder the negotiating process? Be sure to reference the relevant material from Smith's Chapter 7 "Decision Rules and Parliamentary Procedures".

* To what degree did the presiding officers impact the negotiation process? Was there variation in this impact across the different individuals who served as the presiding officer? If so, why? If you served as a presiding officer, incorporate your perspective as leader during that session versus as a member of the plenary in other sessions. If you did not serve as a presiding officer, discuss whether you feel you can truly understand the position without having held it. Be sure to connect this discussion to Smith's consideration of the importance of leadership by presiding officers, in particular from Chapter 7.

* Much of the work of UN delegates occurs not in formal session, but through informal networking. To what degree and in what ways did you engage in informal networking? What impact did these efforts have in comparison to your involvement in formal sessions? Be sure to connect this discussion to Smith's Chapter 8 "Informal Networking: The Personal Side".

* Which countries did you work with the most? Why? Conversely, which countries did you work with the least and why? To what degree are the answers to these questions connected to the different roles that states play in the UN (Smith 30-32)?

* Was there variation across the issues or timing of the negotiations where you felt that your country had more influence over the proceedings? If so, why? If not, why do you think that there was not any variation? How did the factors affecting a state's ability and desire to wield influence (Smith pp. 24-30) effect this process?

* How did your personal attributes effect the role that you played in the simulation? In answering this question, consider the range of attributes covered by Smith (pp. 41-45). What type of UN delegate were you: hunter, farmer, trader, or trapper (Smith 49-50)?

* For each of the topic areas addressed during the simulation, what would you have done differently if you were representing your personal views instead of the national interests of your country? Do you feel that international agreements would be easier to reach if diplomats represented their personal views instead of being bound by the interests of their home governments?

* In general, what did you learn about being a UN diplomat by participating in the simulation that is not addressed in any of the above points?