A practical guide to negotiation simulation writing

Supplement 1: Non-scorable integrative conflict simulations

Introduction

This document serves as a supplement to the article: [Kesting, P., & Smolinski, R. (2023). A Practical Guide to Negotiation Simulation Writing. *Negotiation Journal*, 39(3), 297–326]. In this document, we introduce another type of negotiation simulation that either could not be included in the article due to space limitations or because it was not yet developed at the time of the article's publication. This document builds upon the concepts presented in the article, an understanding of which is necessary to make full use of the supplementary material. We recommend that readers pay particular attention to the article's section on the negotiation simulation development process—which discusses pedagogical objectives and scenarios—and the section on general design principles.

This supplement introduces simulations in the manner that they are presented in the article:

- First, we introduce the type of simulation, discuss its pedagogical purpose, and provide general guidelines for its development and use.
- Second, we provide tables that outline the information that should be included in the text of the simulation.
- Third, we provide one or more examples of negotiation simulations for the respective type.

Some of the simulation types presented in these supplements are variations of those introduced in the article, resulting in some overlap. However, these supplements contain more comprehensive and detailed presentations of some of the simulation types than were possible in the article.

This document contains the simulation "The Gracchian Land Reform" as a blueprint and example for this type of simulation. This simulation is licensed under Creative Commons CC BY-ND and is therefore freely available for educational use.

Non-scorable integrative conflict negotiation simulations

This simulation type is specifically designed to facilitate discussions on conflicts and conflict resolution (Ury et al., 1988). However, it is also highly effective for teaching value creation in negotiations (Fisher et al., 1991) or deepening participants' understanding of its principles. Therefore, it is more suitable for the advanced stages of courses, assuming that the foundational

knowledge has already been established. Conflict simulations can take various forms. Non-scorable integrative simulations, in our view, are the most suitable for conveying the desired content. The conflict negotiation simulations showcased in this supplement can therefore be regarded as a subset falling within this classification.

Fundamentally, crafting this simulation type involves defining three distinct layers of negotiation:

1. Irreconcilable Positions: Positions here are understood in the sense of Fisher et al. (1991) as stances, perspectives, or proposals that a party presents during a negotiation, representing what a party wants or demands from the negotiation process. "Irreconcilable" means that the positions of the parties mutually exclude each other, and no agreement can be reached at this level.
2. Particular Interests: These are the individual concerns, goals, or issues of the parties. Positions are derived from these interests but do not strictly follow them. There are alternative approaches to addressing these particular interests, as exemplified by the "orange example" provided by Fisher et al. (1991, p. 56).
3. Overarching Interests: These are concerns, goals, or issues of fundamental significance that extend beyond individual or specific contexts. They relate to broader societal, organizational, or general aspects. These interests carry significant weight, yet they might not be recognized or addressed by the negotiators.

In this simulation type, the crucial point lies in the need for parties to abandon their initial positions to achieve a resolution. The yardstick for seeking solutions becomes the particular interests of the involved parties. Solutions are crafted in alignment with these interests, which subsequently influence the overarching concerns. Notably, these overarching interests should not be explicitly stated in the text. Instead, a key challenge of the negotiation process lies in the parties' ability to recognize these broader concerns. Thus, a dynamic interplay between particular and overarching interests emerges, significantly impacting the individual well-being of all parties involved. This intricate balance forms the crux of the negotiation dynamics.

The specific focus on conflicts in these simulations imposes a more rigid structure compared to general non-scorable integrative simulations. Particularly, the structure of the challenge is predefined in this context. This pre-established framework simplifies the process of creating these simulations, making this type an excellent entry point into the complexities of non-scorable simulations. The primary challenge in the development of this simulation type lies in constructing a compelling conflict scenario in which all three elements—irreconcilable positions, particular interest, and overarching interests—are seamlessly integrated.

Once this is achieved, and as with other integrative non-scorable simulations, these simulations primarily emphasize presenting a decision problem, with numbers playing a minor or even non-existent role. Subtle details hold great significance in this context. Therefore, it is crucial to assess how negotiators interpret the text, underscoring the importance of focus and clarity. Overloading the text with excessive information is discouraged, as it might compromise the simulation's effectiveness.

For this simulation type, we recommend keeping the textual content concise, typically within the range of 3–5 pages per role, possibly supplemented by figures, images, or other supporting documents. Moreover, based on our experience, it is ideal for negotiations to be conducted in 2:2 or 3:3 constellations. Negotiating in 2:2 or 3:3 constellations, while slightly time-consuming, provide ample room for thorough preparation, typically requiring around 30 minutes, and negotiation sessions, which usually take from 30 to 45 minutes. It is worth noting that the allotted time might need to be extended in more complex negotiation scenarios to ensure comprehensive exploration and resolution of the given challenges.

The structure of the simulation corresponds to that of generic integrative non-scorable simulations. However, in conflict simulations, the decision problem, interests, and options are more rigorously structured, offering a more defined framework for the simulation writing.

Parties	Two parties. Detailed information about the negotiating parties and/or the organizations they represent and that of their counterparts. Additional information about perceptions, reputations, or previous encounters. The negotiation often is associated with a long-term relationship; it might be useful to evaluate the relational outcome of the negotiation based on the SVI (Curhan et al., 2006).
Decision problem	The instructions focus on describing the conflict, its origin, and its significance: who, what, why. Therefore, the instructions emphasize presenting the setting of the conflict or past developments leading to the conflict; background or contextual information should be included in the instructions. Information in the instructions should be distributed in a way that requires negotiators to exchange information for a comprehensive understanding of the situation. Surprises (such as hidden agendas or unexpected information in one side's instructions) can enrich the negotiation process further. The perspectives of the parties should be realistic, allowing negotiators to identify with "their" protagonists. It often proves beneficial to support the case with materials such as maps, letters or emails, invoices, calculations (e.g., of costs or profits), pictures,

	contracts, expert opinions, or any relevant documents that substantiate and enhance the negotiation.
Positions/ interests	Three Levels of positions/interests: 1. Irreconcilable Positions 2. Particular Interests 3. Overarching Interests Multi-dimensional interest structures often encompass basic and peripheral needs. Providing detailed explanations of attitudes and interests can breathe life into the protagonists. The parties have conflicting positions, joint but also conflicting particular interests, and joint overarching interests. The joint interests create the integrative potential. Overarching interests should not be explicitly stated but inferred from the context to make the negotiation more challenging and instructive.
Options and alternatives	The options are not quantitatively one-dimensional as in distributive simulations but are qualitative and multi-dimensional. Options should not be predetermined in the text but developed within the negotiation process. A crucial aspect of the negotiation is to invent options for mutual gain (Fisher et al., 1991).
Remarks	This is a rather specific non-scorable simulation in which the challenge is well defined. It serves as an excellent introduction to this otherwise quite demanding format.

An example of such a non-scorable integrative conflict negotiation simulation is *The Gracchian Land Reform* (Kesting & Smolinski, 2023). This simulation is based on historical events that occurred around the year 133 BC and significantly contributed to the decline of the Roman Republic. We find this period of history to be highly intriguing, especially given the current rise of authoritarianism and nationalism. The events are portrayed as historically accurate as possible. However, the negotiation itself is fictional; such a negotiation never took place.

In this negotiation simulation, the three layers are specified as follows:

1. The irreconcilable positions entail an unconditional demand for or strict rejection of a land reform. These positions are portrayed very rigidly in the instructions provided to both parties. Additionally, the instructions lead each party to believe it is capable of enforcing its demands even against the will of the other party (a conviction shared by the historical protagonists as well).
2. The instructions specify a multitude of particular interests for both parties. These include the preservation of individual prosperity, the maintenance of power and

status for the protagonists, and the restoration of Gracchus' reputation. These interests were researched from historical sources, lending credibility to them.

3. The overarching interests entail the preservation of peace and the continuity of the Roman Republic; they are, therefore, existential for both parties. However, it greatly enriches the negotiation if this significance is not outlined explicitly in the instructions. The instructions provide only a brief overview of the historical events that led to the civil war, ultimately leading to the downfall of the Roman Republic. However, this overview was not directly related to the roles and individual interests; it should only provide hints from which the broader importance of the negotiations can be inferred. A crucial task in the negotiation process is to recognize these hints and incorporate them into the negotiation accordingly. The most important task in the negotiations is therefore to bridge the political gap that has arisen. A prerequisite for this is finding a solution for the land reform that is acceptable to both sides.

We placed great emphasis on portraying the protagonists' roles in a plausible manner, making them appear legitimate so that the negotiators participating in the simulation could identify with them. Gracchus and the Populares are depicted as individuals dedicated to the welfare of Rome, confronting a stagnant establishment. The land reform is presented as necessary to counteract an increasing imbalance within Roman society. The Optimates are portrayed as individuals caught in intrigue and power struggles within the Senate. The land reform is depicted as a plot designed to harm those senators who are reliant on the revenues from their estates. In their eyes, Gracchus's primary motive is seen as seeking revenge for a past humiliation inflicted upon him.

It must be noted that students are generally not familiar with Roman history and may find it challenging to immerse themselves in this context. Against this backdrop, it is advisable to distribute the general—but not the role-specific confidential—instructions of the simulation in advance and encourage students to prepare by reading the Wikipedia entry on Tiberius Gracchus (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tiberius_Gracchus).

References

Curhan, J. R., Xu, H., & Elfenbein, H. A. (2006). What Do People Value When They Negotiate? Mapping the Domain of Subjective Value in Negotiation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *91*(3), 493-512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.3.493

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: negotiating agreement without giving in* (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.

Kesting, P., & Smolinski, R. (2023). A Practical Guide to Negotiation Simulation Writing. *Negotiation Journal*, 39(3), 297-326.
Kesting, P., & Smolinski, R. (2023). *The Gracchian Land Reform*. Published at the TNC finals at LUISS in Rome.
Ury, W. L., Brett, J. M., & Goldberg, S. B. (1988). *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems to Cut the Costs of Conflict*. Wiley.

Peter Kesting

THE GRACCHIAN LAND REFORM

General instructions[1]

The Gracchan land reform in the 2nd century BC is one of the most decisive events in the history of the Roman Empire. The struggle over it led to an undermining of the constitution and a disregard for the political norms. Politics was no longer based on balance but on intrigue and violence. The Gracchan land reform is, therefore, one of the main reasons for the outbreak of the Roman civil wars and the end of the republic. This is how the events are reported by Appian and Plutarch.

Background

In the beginning, there was the Second Punic War between the Romans and the Carthaginians for supremacy in the Mediterranean. The legendary crossing of the Alps by the Carthaginian commander Hannibal took place during this war. The Roman army consisted mainly of farmers who not only had to equip themselves but also had to leave their estates. The prolonged duration of the war resulted in many farmers losing their livelihoods. The land fell to the large landowners, and the farmers migrated to the cities where they mostly lived in impoverished and precarious conditions.

Basic outlines of the land reform

In order to remedy the situation, the tribune Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus proposed land reform in 133 BC. The conditions of the proposed land reform included:

- Redistribution of Public Land: Gracchus wanted to order the distribution of ager publicus to landless proletarians to restore smallholder farming. Ager publicus was state land, some of which was leased to private individuals. The ager publicus had grown enormously as a result of Rome's wars in Italy because the Romans annexed

[1] This role-play was written by Peter Kesting, Aarhus University, and Remigiusz Smolinski, HHL – Leipzig Graduate School of Management. It is based on the historical events related to the Gracchian land reform. The statements on Roman history in the text are essentially based on the corresponding entries in Wikipedia and ChatGPT research. But that is only the background—the focus is on the structure of the negotiation situation. Historical events have been simplified accordingly and adapted for educational purposes. This simulation is licensed under creative commons CC BY-ND. For more information, please visit: https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/cclicenses/. Please tell us when and how you used the simulation. Contact: petk@mgmt.au.dk.

up to a third of the area of the Italian tribes they had conquered and incorporated this land into their national territory. Land leasing was a major source of wealth and, therefore, highly competitive.

- Limitation on Land Ownership: Gracchus wanted to impos a limit on the amount of land an individual could own in Italy. This limit was set at 500 iugera (around 125 hectares) of irrigated land or 1000 iugera (around 250 hectares) of unirrigated land.
- Restrictions on Inheritance: The reform should also place restrictions on the inheritance of land. Only direct descendants were allowed to inherit land, and if there were no direct descendants, the land would revert back to the state.
- Creation of Land Commission: Gracchus wanted to establish a Land Commission that was responsible for the implementation of the reforms. The commission was also tasked with ensuring that the land was being used productively.

Overall, the Gracchian land reform was aimed at reducing poverty and ensuring that land was distributed more fairly among the Roman population. While there is no precise estimate of how many families were negatively affected by the Gracchian land reforms, it is believed that they impacted a significant portion of the Roman population. According to some ancient sources, as many as 75,000 families may have received land as a result of the reforms, although this figure is likely an exaggeration (ager publicus is marked in brown in the picture).

Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, tribune of the plebs, as the main promoter of the land reform

The initiator of the land reform of 133 BC was the tribune Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus. The office of the tribune of the plebs was established in 494 BC to protect the rights and interests of the common people (the plebeians) against the power of the wealthy and powerful aristocracy (the patricians). There were ten tribunes at the same time, elected for one year by the plebeians only, that is, besides Gracchus there were nine other tribunes. The tribunes were initially granted the power of veto, which meant that they could reject any law or decision made by the Roman Senate or any other magistrate who was controlled by the patricians. Since 287 BC, the tribunes also had the right to propose legislation known as "plebiscites" (plebiscita in Latin). The process of proposing and passing a law in ancient Rome was relatively straightforward: It involved a tribune drafting the proposed law and presenting it to the Senate. The Senate had the power to either approve or reject the proposal. If the Senate rejected the proposal, the tribune could still submit it to the Concilium Plebis, which was a popular assembly

of the common people, where it would be voted on. However, if the Senate approved the proposal, it would become law without requiring a vote from the Concilium Plebis. The power of the tribunes to propose plebiscites was a significant tool in the struggle between the plebeians and the patricians, who were the aristocratic class that held most of the political power in the early Roman Republic. By proposing and passing laws that benefited the plebeians, the tribunes were able to chip away at the power of the patricians and increase the political power of the plebeian class. The interaction of both bodies was part of the ius agendi cum senatu to the reciprocally created principle ius agendi cum plebe. The Senate and People of Rome (SPQR).

However, the possibility of a plebiscite was not used comprehensively or consistently, but only in certain situations, mostly to take action from the popular side against representatives of the magistracy. In fact, each tribune operated between 287 and 133 BC. mostly with the consent of the Senate.

Hence, it is not unusual for Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus to be affiliated with the aristocracy instead of the plebeian class. In fact, the Gracchi clan was among the most influential and esteemed of the Roman patricians. The younger Tiberius, specifically, was the firstborn son of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus the elder, a two-time consul in 177 BC and 163 BC, and Cornelia, who was the daughter of Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, the celebrated conqueror of Hannibal.

Resistance against the land reform

The political agenda of Gracchus was not groundbreaking, as other aristocrats had pursued similar goals before him. Evidence of this can be seen in Consul Gaius Laelius' 140 BC effort to pass an "arable law" with intentions similar to those of the Gracchian land reform. However, Laelius' plans were ultimately abandoned due to opposition from several other senators. Given Laelius' past failed attempt, Tiberius must have been aware that he would face significant resistance in the Senate. In 133 BC, the coalition of supporters of a land reform was not particularly extensive, but it included Appius Claudius Pulcher, the "princeps senatus" and thus a prominent figure in Roman politics.

As anticipated, the reforms faced formidable resistance, primarily from the lower-ranking senators who heavily relied on the ager publicus. Tiberius Gracchus encountered opposition not only from the senatorial faction but also from other influential groups in the Roman society, such as the equestrian class, which constituted the business elite of Rome. The proposed land

reforms posed a direct threat to their economic interests, and thus they too opposed the changes.

Such was the course of history

This moment marked perhaps the final opportunity to settle the issue peacefully. Historically, this opportunity has not been used and Gracchus introduced the reform directly to the people's assembly. Contrary to custom, he did not even submit the bill to the Senate for a vote beforehand, which in itself was an affront. Although he was a friend of Gracchus, Marcus Octavius, one of the co-governing tribunes, initially blocked the law with his veto due to pressure from affected landowners, including himself. Gracchus subsequently had Octavius voted out of office by a vote in the popular assembly and, following this violation of the constitution, had the law passed by the popular assembly. However, when he attempted to be re-elected as tribune, which would have been another violation of the constitution, his opponents in the Senate saw it as an attempted coup. Tiberius Gracchus' reform efforts ended with his assassination by Roman elites on the Field of Mars. None of his killers were brought to trial.

As a result, violence and breaches of the constitution eroded the political system and paved the way for civil war and the fall of the Roman Republic. Modern historians have concluded that the decline of the Roman Republic began with the inability of the Roman aristocracy to settle their growing rivalry peacefully. The civil wars that followed and, above all, the reign of terror of Lucius Cornelius Sulla Felix in the years 82-79 BC claimed many victims, both among the reformers and among the leading families of the Senate. The troubled times lasted for more than 100 years and only ended with the seizure of power by Augustus in 30 BC. The empire that followed led to the senate being largely disempowered.

The negotiation – it's up to you to do better!

At this point we want to step into the course of history and imagine that a law stipulates that if a bill introduced by the People's Tribune is rejected by the Senate, certified negotiators of the opposing factions must sit down at the table for a final negotiation in which they seriously and in the best interests of the Roman Republic seek a solution to the conflict.

THE GRACCHIAN LAND REFORM

Confidential instructions for the chartered negotiators of the opposing Senators (Optimates)

As a chartered negotiator, you are entrusted with representing the interests of your client, while also conducting negotiations in the best interests of the Roman Republic. Any agreement reached must be mutually accepted by both parties, or the negotiations are considered to have failed. The judges will determine the acceptability of the agreement. The following is a depiction of the situation from the perspective of the opposing Senators:

This is what the senators think about Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus

Gracchus is a loser and has lost all legitimacy. He was very promising at the beginning and has had a career worth mentioning. At the young age of fifteen he accompanied the then consul Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus in the Third Punic War (147 BC) and went in 137 BC with the consul Gaius Hostilius Mancinus as quaestor to the province of Hispania citerior.

The downfall of Tiberius Gracchus came with the capitulation of the Roman army at Numantia (near present-day Garray, Spain), which was one of the heaviest defeats suffered by a Roman army up to that point. Gracchus, as quaestor, was responsible for the capitulation and was instrumental in formulating a "peace agreement" with the Lusitanians. This surrender was a disgrace and violated the Roman code, for which Gracchus is held responsible. Even worse, however, was the "peace agreement" which Gracchus formulated in an attempt to save himself. The agreement allowed the Roman army to retreat freely while recognizing the territory occupied by Viriathus as his independent dominion and calling him the friend of the Roman people (Latin: amicus populi Romani). This act is seen as cowardly and dishonorable to the Roman army. The battle should not have been lost, and if it was, Tiberius should have gone down with the army instead of begging for mercy.

There are several good reasons why the Roman Senate did not accept the "peace contract" with Viriathus.

- Firstly, the Roman Senate saw Viriathus as a rebel and a threat to their control over the Iberian Peninsula. The Senate believed that accepting peace with him would be a sign of weakness and would encourage other tribes to rebel against Roman rule.
- Secondly, there were also personal vendettas involved. Roman commanders and officials who had been defeated by Viriathus wanted revenge and were unwilling to accept any peace terms that did not involve his surrender or death.
- Lastly, there were also political considerations at play. Some senators were eager to use the Lusitanian War as a way to gain political power and influence, and were unwilling to accept a “peace agreement” that did not benefit their own personal interests.

If only Gracchus had been handed over to the Numantines after the rejection by the Senate, as was done with his friend Mancinus, who was sent to the enemy naked and with his hands tied. Mancinus was dishonored and politically finished after that. That would have been the only just punishment for Gracchus. However, his noble origins and powerful friends saved him from it. If Gracchus had been properly punished, there would be no problems now. The Senators firmly believe that if tough and consistent action is not taken, the problems will continue to haunt them. This also applies to the forthcoming negotiation. Any sign of weakness should never be shown.

This is what the senators think about the land reform

The idea of land reform is baseless and merely an excuse. Hardly 50 years before Tiberius Gracchus there was an abundance of ager publicus and few landless people in need of it. Consequently, the opportunity arose to seize the land without much difficulty.

The often-heard claim that military service impoverished the rural population is not correct. Indeed, it is not the farmers themselves who were drafted for wars, but rather their younger sons. This practice indicates that the wars would not have caused an agrarian crisis, as those who were surplus to the farms tended to die in battlefields. In addition, many people voluntarily abandoned their farms in search of a better life in the

rapidly expanding city of Rome, rendering land reform ineffective in addressing this issue.

In truth, Gracchus' motivations appear to be less driven by a desire to alleviate poverty and more centred on salvaging his own career, which he himself has compromised. It is widely believed that Gracchus' mother fueled his insatiable ambition, leading him to prioritize personal glory over the well-being of the people he claims to serve. His actions suggest that he cannot tolerate the prospect of a rival eclipsing him in terms of reputation and renown. In other words, he is an egomaniac!

The land reform proposed by Gracchus, if implemented, would create significant difficulties for many of the opposing senators who currently possess far larger plots of land than the proposed 500/1000 iugera, and rely on the profits generated by their land holdings. Without these profits, their standard of living, and therefore their influence, would decrease significantly, causing their families to decline in social status. This is why there is such staunch opposition; it is a fight for survival. This concerns a majority of families in the Senate, and this is precisely what the Populares intend.

In recent decades, the wars that Rome wages on its external borders have become a source of legendary wealth. The basis for this is plunder, tribute payments, enslavement, and land seizures from the defeated enemies. The problem is that only a few families benefit from this; a good portion of the Senate members, who are not involved in the wars, are left empty-handed. They are deprived of this source of income and have little else besides profits from their rural estates. In the Roman aristocracy, there is a ruthless competition that has always been present. For many of the supporters in the Senate, land reform is nothing more than a strategic move to weaken their competition. It is no wonder that the supporters of the reform are largely composed of war profiteers who are not dependent on income from the land.

This directs their attention to an entirely different issue: War is a matter for the entire nation, and it cannot be that its fruits are distributed so unevenly. A way must be found to distribute the riches more fairly.

Regarding the land reform in detail: the limitation proposed by Gracchus to 500/1000 iugera is absolutely unacceptable. If land is to be distributed, the current owners must be adequately compensated by being paid the lost income annually. The rules regarding inheritance are acceptable in themselves, but they must include the

possibility of adoption - a practice that is widespread among patricians. It is especially important that you control the commission. You must make sure of that. If you succeed, you can delay the implementation of the reform as much as you want.

The whole approach of Gracchus and his supporters appears highly problematic to you. Competition is good as long as it benefits the state. But Rome has always lived on balance. Here, however, it's about destruction. The consequence of the land reform would be the disintegration and weakening of the upper class. This would destroy a balance that has sustained the Roman Republic for centuries. At present, there is no longer competition among the senators, but enmity. You must still be able to resolve conflicts peacefully through consensus, otherwise, the entire state is in danger! The other side cannot possibly want that. Do they even realize what kind of game they are playing?

The aim of the senators in the coming negotiations is to prevent the land reform. The senators perceive the situation as very tense, but also still assume that they have it under control. Octavius' veto prevents the reform from being passed in a plebiscite against the will of the Senate. The senators expressed their delight that they were able to win Octavius over to their side and solve the problem so elegantly. With the next election, the danger is completely averted because Gracchus is then no longer the tribune of the plebs (the constitution forbids re-election). The senators therefore see no reason to make major concessions in the coming negotiations.

The negotiations are now imminent and will take place in the Curia Hostilia in the heart of Rome. You still have a little time to prepare and work out a strategy for the negotiation.

THE GRACCHIAN LAND REFORM

Confidential instructions for the chartered negotiators of Tiberius Gracchus and his followers (Populares)

As a chartered negotiator, you are entrusted with representing the interests of your client, while also conducting negotiations in the best interests of the Roman Republic. Any agreement reached must be mutually accepted by both parties, or the negotiations are considered to have failed. The judges will determine the acceptability of the agreement. The following is a depiction of the situation from the perspective of Gracchus and his followers:

Reasons for a land reform

Tiberius Gracchus and his followers firmly believe that the current situation is unacceptable and must be changed. They argue that it is unjust because poverty results from serving the Roman people. Additionally, they believe that it is unnecessary for the beneficiaries to have more than 500/1000 iugeras of public land at their disposal, as greater wealth should be self-earned and not gifted by the state. Finally, they assert that the current situation is dangerous because it creates instability and weakens the Roman Republic.

A new and fair distribution of the ager publicus can achieve two particular things. Firstly, it can free large parts of the Roman population from poverty and lack of property, which currently makes them dependent on state grain deliveries and forces them to live in overcrowded slums within the city.

On the other hand, a new and fair distribution of the ager publicus can serve to remedy the existence-threatening lack of men capable of military service. Since the end of the Third Punic War, the number of Roman citizens recorded in the census has fallen from 337,000 to under 318,000. Consequently, there are no longer sufficient soldiers for the

legions to fight the exhausting and grueling wars against the uprisings in the provinces (primarily in Spain, as we will discuss later). Under the current military constitution, only citizens who possessed sufficient assets to provide their equipment and armament were called up for service in the legion. Therefore, propertyless citizens (capite censi), who have moved and continue to move en masse into the city of Rome, cannot be relied upon to provide the necessary soldiers.

Other motives

Tiberius Gracchus and his followers are sincerely and honestly convinced of their cause. However, it cannot be denied that there are also personal motives for carrying out the land reform. In reality, Tiberius Gracchus was destined for a successful career in the Roman upper class. At the young age of fifteen, he accompanied the then-consul Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus in the Third Punic War (147 BC) and later, in 137 BC, served as quaestor to the province of Hispania citerior alongside the consul Gaius Hostilius Mancinus.

The turning point in Tiberius Gracchus' career came with the capitulation of the Roman army at Numantia (near present-day Garray, Spain), which was one of the heaviest defeats of a Roman army up to that point. Gracchus was responsible for the capitulation and, as quaestor, played a key role in formulating a peace agreement with the Lusitanians. However, the Senate refused to ratify the treaty, and he was nearly handed over to the enemy as a result. Fortunately, his noble origins and powerful friends saved him from the ignominious fate that befell Mancinus, who was stripped naked and had his hands bound before being surrendered to the enemy. Mancinus' dishonour led to the end of his political career.

The defeat of the Roman army at Numantia was undoubtedly a disgrace for which Gracchus bears some responsibility, as it clearly violated the Roman Code. However, the Senate's refusal to ratify the peace agreement with the Lusitanians is a sign of their hubris and cannot be excused. The terms of the agreement were perfectly reasonable, with the Roman army granted a free retreat, Viriathus declared a friend of the Roman people (Latin: amicus populi Romani) in return, and the territory he occupied recognized as his independent dominion. After his victory, Viriathus did not seek revenge but rather reconciliation. The goal of the agreement was to achieve a just and sustainable peace that would make allies out of enemies. The Senate's rejection not

only caused endless suffering but also tied up many resources of the Romans today. This attitude of arrogance from the Senate benefits no one and is what bothers Gracchus most. This hubris will eventually lead to Rome's downfall.

After the experiences on the Iberian Peninsula, Gracchus had his back to the wall politically and urgently needed a spectacular success. His experiences and the reaction of the Roman Senate brought him into conflict with parts of the Senate and their politics for the first time. On his journey, however, he also recognized the grievances caused by the slave economy and the burden on the rural population caused by military service. Gracchus was additionally persuaded by his two Greek advisers, Diophanes of Mitylene and Blossios of Cyme, to take up the land distribution project again. As a result, distancing himself from the ruling elite on the one hand and willingness to reform the Roman state on the other became the guidelines for Gracchus' actions.

In his actions, however, Gracchus also and above all thinks of restoring his honour and taking the place in society to which he was entitled from birth. Land reform is a daring but promising political enterprise—and a just and forward-looking one at that. It encumbers many of its opponents and inflicts serious damage, cornering them downright. It also gives him popularity; the people have repeatedly encouraged Gracchus in graffiti on public buildings and monuments to give the poor population back the land. Popularity is very helpful for achieving goals in Rome.

Disagreement in the senate

It wasn't difficult for Gracchus to find allies for his project. Actually, a deep divide currently runs through the Senate. In recent decades, some senators have become very rich. The main source of their wealth is plunder, tribute payments, enslavement, and land seizures in the wars that Rome conducts at its outer borders. These senators are convinced that they are the high achievers to whom Rome owes its glory and true greatness. Without them, Rome would have become a vassal of Carthage and sunk into mediocrity.

Tiberius was able to gather some of these senators around him. Rome is very competitive, and land reform is a good opportunity for some senators to inflict damage on their annoying competitors. They think it's just a clever move in the eternal game of power.

Many of Gracchus's supporters accuse the opposing senators of laziness and complacency, which they find very un-Roman. In their opinion, many of the senators lead a quiet life and benefit from what others have created for them, especially from the land that others have conquered for them. Gracchus particularly laments that these very people then interfere in the affairs of the high achievers, as happened in Spain. These senators then refused a wise and just solution due to their arrogance and ignorance, insisting on their principles of Roman superiority. It is not good to always dominate; sometimes one must also seek reconciliation.

All of this has led to a deep division in the Senate and turned opponents into enemies. Gracchus and his allies are firmly determined to win this war and want land reform in any case; they don't want to give in at this point. They are sure they can pull this off, one way or another. Gracchus still has a few tricks up his sleeve on how to use his position to achieve victory. If he doesn't succeed in getting his goals through in this negotiation, he will find other ways; the end justifies the means. If Rome is to have a future, the arrogance of the Senate's power must be broken.

The negotiations are now imminent and will take place in the Curia Hostilia in the heart of Rome. You still have a little time to prepare and work out a strategy for the negotiation.