crime cases with states and political leaders testifying; and (7) ad-hoc summits for coordination in cases of terror attacks, hostage takings, natural disasters, or environmental hazards.

Examples from past face-to-face, cyber, and hybrid simulations we have conducted illustrate the many options you and your students have in shaping the process of world politics.

Process in a Face-to-Face Simulation

The Gulf nuclear simulation took place during a half-day face-to-face meeting. It was designed as a multtopic diplomatic simulation primarily on the Iran nuclear program but also on the Palestinian issue and other current affairs in Middle East politics. The simulation opening announcement and work plan, illustrated in figure 6.6, was presented to teams in class at the beginning of the face-to-face meeting. Once the world politics process began, we took a step backward and students became the main driving force.

The UN General Assembly session on the Gulf nuclear issue began with opening speeches, prepared ahead of time by representatives of each team. The media attended the session but did not participate in its discussions. Some speakers were better than others, but given the short time assigned for each participant, the stage was immediately set for multilateral negotiations on the key matters that each team had placed on the agenda.

After the official gathering and opening speeches, multilateral negotiations took place in the Gulf nuclear and Palestinian working groups. Participants in each group had to prepare a short document of agreement on three major points we had set in the opening scenario. The goal of reaching an agreement, despite the gaps in national interests and under extreme time pressure, was designed to capture the essence of crisis decision-making in world politics.

During synchronous face-to-face interactions, bilateral secret talks behind the scenes were coupled with formal multilateral negotiations that were open to the media. A notable example of the secret activities was a move made by the U.S. president who asked the Egyptian president to meet outside the negotiation room once the talks had reached a deadlock. A few minutes later, both players were back at the negotiation table with the Egyptian leader cooperating more closely with the United States. As it later became evident, the Egyptian team was promised specific rewards for their support of the American side. Another interesting example is the behind-the-scenes information the Israeli prime minister acquired about the Iranian plan to strike first through the diversionary use of a nonstate actor. This information was leaked by media reporters, showing the crucial role the media may play in shaping the process of world politics.

According to the simulation rules, both the Iranian and the Israeli leaders requested permission to use military force almost simultaneously and their requests were approved after the multilateral negotiation efforts had failed. Our consent to these requests shifted the topic of the simulation to the “day after” diplomacy, an interesting turning point that we had not planned. Amazingly, the two media teams had anticipated military strikes and the films they had prepared in advance blended well with
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Fig. 6.6. Gulf nuclear simulation schedule
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General Assembly of the United Nations

67th regular session of the General Assembly

Work Program of the 67th Session

10:00 – Opening speeches
10:30 – Multilateral negotiations in working groups, 1st session
11:15 – Coffee break
11:30 – Media releases
11:45 – Multilateral negotiations in working groups, 2nd session
12:15 – Plenary meeting and vote on resolutions