1. My model UN career began my Freshman year in 2012. My first year, I went to RUMUN and ILMUNC in DISCEC and UNESCO respectively, earning an Outstanding at ILMUNC. Sophomore year, I finally graduated from ill-fitting GA’s and found my niche and the down and dirty works of Crisis Committees. I began my crisis experience at William and Mary, working for the Northern Alliance in our feeble attempt at holding off the Taliban from consuming Afghanistan. I then participated in Crises at PMUNC (the Berlin Conference pretty much turned into a crisis), ILMUNC (where I won my first gavel), CMUNC, and WAMUNC. I had a generally successful Sophomore year, and I’m looking forward to kicking off my Junior year at my first ever security council at PMUNC!

1. The next world crisis will be caused by religious tensions in Western Europe. Currently, there is no unifying religion throughout this region. On top of that, the economies of nations such as Spain, Italy, and Greece are failing, leaving people to rely on religion to guide them through hard times. This plus the lack of unity causes strife and tension within such nations. However, as Western Europe continues to modernize, traditional religions such as Islam tend to fade out. This only worsens the problem. As a result, the only way for Fundamental Islam to grow and expand is to assert itself through extremism. And as the old adage goes (with a twist), “if you can’t beat ‘em, make them join you.” Radical Islamists have recently, and will continue to draw suggestible teenagers from its arch-enemy, “The Wicked World of the West”, and these terror fighters will eventually come home and wreak havoc on their own land. This would then cause issues with crime, and possible hotspots for terrorist cells. Lastly, along with modernization, the use of social networking sites is at an all-time high in European nations. This opens the door for Radical Islam to spread to the impressionable population on sites like Twitter and Facebook. Western Europe is becoming more and more vulnerable to the threat of Islamic extremism, as Islamic extremism becomes more and more powerful a threat. This will open the door for both religious tensions in non-secular states as well as possible incubators of terrorists.
2. and 4. I’ve combined these two questions for a few reasons. First of all, if a Utopia is even possible, I definitely have not seen one, whether it is in literature or reality. At least as Lowry, Huxley, Bradbury, and Orwell would suggest, an attempt at a Utopia is the first ingredient for a Dystopia. The second reason I combined the two is because my favorite dystopian future happens to be what I affirm as the first step towards Utopia. My ideal Dystopia is not some oppressive regime, or mutual political machine running on the military-industrial complex, but the lack of society whatsoever. I love the idea that at some point, all civilization will dissolve, whether it be from disease, nuclear warfare, asteroid, or some granola hipster movement where everyone decides they’re too cool for society anyway, and everyone retreats to the woods (I fear the latter is the most imminent). The Nature reclaims our vestigial cities, and we finally see whether it was Locke or Hobbes who had it right. We go back to the hunter-gatherer system, and life devolves back to what it once was. However, this is also my favorite Utopia. When my dad was 9, his dad took him on a journey down the Amazon river. At that time, the area was still uncivilized, and cannibals were a very real threat. The one thing my dad remembered though, was how happy they all were. They lived short, smiled often, and existed in the simplest of means, and they loved it. To me, this is the only way a Utopia can exist: without any society whatsoever. There would be no corruption, no warfare, and no general hatred, because no one can afford to hate or wage war. Just like how the kids had to button the back of each other’s’ clothes in Brave New World, interdependence would be the only means of survival. And that is the single concept that all Utopias strive for.
3. It’s reasonable to believe that when the world ends, so will the internal systems that comprise it. As a result, one may find it more imaginable that capitalism may perish before the world, as capitalism can go without the world ending, but not vice-versa. However this logical assertion can be equalized with one simple conjecture: without capitalism, the world would surely perish as well. During the Cold War, the Soviets based their economy around the belief that economics was a zero-sum game, and as a result, all the wealth should be equalized. They believed that since one inherently loses when the other gains, capitalism would lead to wealth disparity which would lead to social inequality which would lead to a political overthrow. The Americans however, used a capitalistic system, which held as its fundamental principle that wealth was not limited. Anyone and everyone could be an entrepreneur, so you might as well give them all the opportunity. As a result, the American system grew much stronger economically, and was able to support much more political expansion and economic leverage. The Soviets, on the other hand, had systematically limited their potential, and thus faltered and fell when they couldn't cover their own ends in places like Afghanistan and Cuba and East Germany. Their wealth was stagnant as their population increased, and thus they dissolved. They believed that the pie was a set size, and that they might as well split it up evenly. However, the Americans just made *a bigger pie*. If the world were to follow the flawed Soviet economic system, it would look a lot like Russia now, which I most definitely consider the end of the world. The nations would be a transient mesh of continued warfare, led by self-proclaimed dictators declaring hegemony over each other. Thus, I consider the end of the world and capitalism as one in the same, and both equally disturbing.
4. In 2050, I will be 63 years old, and at the prime of my existence. At about that time, I will have finally started the third stage of the Carnegie Dictum, where I move from the learning and earning aspects of life to the giving-back. Of course, the point of the Dictum is to intertwine all three concepts throughout one’s life, but I’d also like to stage them out. In 2050, if all goes well, I will be teaching consumer economics at an inner-city high school. Hopefully I will have concluded a meaningful and helpful time in public service, and I may have even accomplished the Sisyphean task of reforming our “injustice” system, as I like to call it. I’d like to be able to send my last child off to college by 63, just in time to hop back into school myself. Most importantly about the year 2050; I don’t want to also see the year 2080. Life expectancy has historically grown faster than senior life conditions, and I don’t want to be alive if I’m not contributing anything emotionally, physically, or mentally the world or its inhabitants. I believe in quality over quantity, especially when it comes to life.