Whose Terms?

Teaching review · 26 October 2026

INSTRUCTOR PACKET / FACILITATION

A seat is an opening. Authority is a question.

Evidence and revision

First recorded reasoning and source selections remain available at every encounter. Compare original and current versions as evidence of revision. An imported record may not establish when its earliest retained answer was written. The existing writing minima, source selections, after-outcome reflections and checkpoint remain. No political conclusion is scored.

At encounter 2, use Who holds the deciding pen? to inspect three formal legal powers, then compare each with E2. This maps formal powers, not every practice. Returning letters 10–12 identify the earlier recorded delegate, service or funding choice shaping the letter. Inspect this notebook entry opens the latest saved explanation and attached sources; these may include edits after the policy was recorded. The first recorded reason is retained separately. These are learner choices in a constructed case, not historical committee testimony.

Quick start for the current game

Your role. You play a Palestinian civic adviser to a fictional committee under the real British Mandate. Its goals are useful public work, accountable public voice, and self-government. Committee choices and model outcomes are invented; dated institutions, policies, and source documents are historical. The later workshop asks you to assess Khalidi using evidence.

Choose an opening mode

Just for learning retains all cases, evidence, choices, and feedback. Writing and name are optional; no submission is required. Choose For class for assigned work, enter your name, and follow the assigned route and settings. Switching modes preserves writing and reopens missing class work.

For class retains all 18 encounters, displayed writing minima and specified source pins, two after-outcome reflections, the midpoint backup after encounter 9, and the final account. The existing requirements and 330-word minimum total are unchanged.

Use the game in this order

The task overview shows choice and card counts before you open details.

• Situation: read the case and the question. Identify the committee's available choices and who holds authority.

• Evidence: read a source and its limit. Use Pin to response to attach it to this encounter. Opening or reading a source alone does not pin it.

• Decide: choose a move. If proposing another approach, select its practical route for the next scenario.

• Explain: connect a source detail to your reason, then Record the move. Read the designed consequence and carry it forward. Complete the two after-outcome reflections when required. The four phases remain the same.

Explain and test the argument

Evidence is material used to support or test a claim; your answer record contains your own choices and writing. Saving does not submit work.

Reconstruct Khalidi's account accurately. Connect a named rule, actor, or resource to a consequence. Use the evidence the prompt specifies and explain its relevance, limits, or a serious alternative. Supported disagreement is allowed. Keep historical records, scholarly interpretation, fictional perspectives, and model outcomes distinct. Word counts check length, not argument quality. Completion confirms required entries, not a grade or certification of learning.

Save and hand in work

Use Save & export. Browser saves stay with this browser and address. Keep a JSON file to resume on another device or between online and downloaded copies. PDF, HTML, and TXT are readable records; submit the format your course requests separately to Canvas or your course system. Nothing is sent automatically. Just for learning records are personal; no submission is required.

Using the detailed guide

Detailed guidance follows. Older Explore, Exploration, and Practice labels mean Just for learning. Names are optional for learning and required for class. All assigned academic tasks and minima remain; this quick start adds none.

Use the backstory as part of the investigation

Origins and recurring perspectives help students explain why a choice matters. At a decision, ask whose circumstances make the account persuasive, which factual claim can be tested, and who bears the consequences. Then examine the relevant source and its limits. Do not treat all accounts as equally accurate or mark disagreements about values as factual errors.

Use the existing writing and debrief tasks; this update adds no separate assignment. Look for a fair account of another person's reasoning, a specific evidence-based correction or qualification, and a traceable connection between a rule and a human consequence. Distinguish documented history, scholarly interpretation, fictional composite perspectives, and designed model outcomes. The added practical context can extend beyond the assigned author without being attributed to that author.

A source-based simulation created by Yoav Duman, centered on Rashid Khalidi's The Iron Cage. Intended for introductory university students, including UW freshmen. Students advise a fictional civic committee, preserve useful public work, and investigate what constitutional recognition and reserved authority permit.

What students should be able to do

• Distinguish demographic majority, institutional recognition, jurisdiction, representation, and sovereign authority.

• Explain a mechanism connecting external rules with leadership, funding, or organizing choices, while preserving meaningful agency.

• Use a dated source for an appropriately bounded claim; distinguish record, interpretation, and model output.

• Revisit an explanation after an outcome without treating a new justification as evidence of an original intention.

At a glance

18 encounters in 7 chapters. Estimated 90-120 minutes of active individual work; add discussion and debrief time. For class requires a name, decisions, short explanations, and sources where indicated. Just for learning retains the full investigation with optional writing, an optional name, and no submission. Minimum writing is 330 words across 18 explanations and 2 reflections; this is a floor, not a quality standard.

Prepare the session

Post the case link and Student Guide. Choose the submission format and due time. Check that students can download and locate a JSON file. Provide an alternative route for students with device or access needs. Pair discussion is possible, but ask each student to keep a record if assessing individual reasoning.

Public case: yoavduman.com/lab/whose-terms/a-seat-with-conditions

INSTRUCTOR PACKET / PACING

Two parts. One notebook.

Part one / approximately 45-55 minutes

Encounters 1-9: orientation, official standing, majority and power, delegate selection, the agency proposal, national political capacity, the May 1930 meeting, written terms, and an honest achievement checkpoint. The in-game chapter estimates for this section sum to 46 minutes.

Checkpoint / after encounter 9

New For class sessions require a portable-backup step here: a JSON export request or the manual progress-text route. Ask students to verify possession, close the activity, and step away. Resume in a second meeting or after a real break. The game pauses its activity timer; it does not verify that a student rested or kept the downloaded file. Earlier saves remain compatible and may not enforce this checkpoint.

Part two / approximately 55-65 minutes

Encounters 10-18: public services, funding terms, organizing, a 1936 council proposal, and the explicit present-day workshop. The workshop inspects 1939 policy, changes one rule, tests remaining material constraints, selects evidence, and produces a closing assessment. The remaining chapter estimates sum to 63 minutes.

Add a short debrief

• What did the committee actually prepare or achieve? What remained a request or proposal?

• Which authority remained outside the committee, and how did that shape a concrete route?

• What could historical evidence establish that the programmed consequence could not?

• Which reason changed after an outcome? Was this a correction, a new value judgment, or a claim about an earlier motive?

Timing is an estimate. Five prior student walkthroughs were simulated design reviews, not observed human testing or validated completion-time data. Adjust the schedule after using the activity with your class.

INSTRUCTOR PACKET / ASSESSMENT

Assess the explanation.

Use the student’s selected evidence, written account, source limits, and final reflection. Strategic options have tradeoffs; the activity has no correct-answer multiple-choice challenge or incorrect-click count. Reading speed and route changes are not measures of historical understanding.

A suggested 10-point rubric

Mechanism (0-3): Names a specific institutional rule and explains how it changes options, rather than simply listing structure and agency.

Evidence (0-3): Uses a relevant, identified source detail; keeps its date, scope, and limits clear.

Historical/model distinction (0-2): Separates documented arrangements and scholarly interpretation from the fictional committee's decisions and programmed consequences.

Reconsideration (0-2): Names evidence that could revise the account and clearly identifies what, if anything, changed after an outcome.

Use post-facto rationalization carefully

The two after-outcome reflections preserve the first recorded reason, selected route, source pins, and original model outcome when available. Later drafts can change without silently replacing that first record. A changed reason may reflect learning, a corrected misunderstanding, or a different value judgment. Do not label it dishonesty or infer a psychological trait from the record alone. Older imported saves may have unverified first-record timing.

Collect the work

Ask for the readable PDF, HTML, or text response record through your LMS. Students retain the JSON file for resuming; it is not itself an automatic submission. The activity runs in the browser and does not send responses to an instructor dashboard. Browser storage is address-specific, so moving between hosted and downloaded copies requires export/import.

INSTRUCTOR PACKET / SOURCES & BOUNDARIES

Teach the frame. Keep the argument open.

The central reading is Rashid Khalidi, The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood (2006; Oneworld edition, 2007), especially chapter 2, printed pp. 31-64. Explicit extensions use chapters 1, 3, and 4. Page numbers refer to the printed book, not a generic PDF viewer count.

The Source Companion reproduces the game's 20 evidence cards, their limits, notices, and citations, followed by the reference list and glossary. It does not include or distribute the complete book. All required task background is in the simulation; a complete-book reading assignment requires access through your normal course arrangements.

Keep these boundaries visible

• Nadia, Salim, Mariam, Khalil, and Yusuf are composite teaching characters. Committee correspondence, funding clauses, and projects are designed.

• Real policies and documents retain their dates. The narrative committee ends in 1936. The 1939 policy is inspected in a present-day workshop; the player does not change the historical timeline.

• Model output illustrates a programmed relationship. It cannot independently corroborate Khalidi or establish a counterfactual outcome.

• Khalidi is credited for the scholarship; the simulation is created by Yoav Duman. The cover is contemporary AI-generated conceptual art, not a recovered historical image.

Files in the release

Student Guide; Instructor Guide; Printable Notebook; Source Companion; cover sheet; offline HTML simulation; classroom ZIP; website/artwork ZIP; complete ZIP. Guides are also supplied as accessible, printable HTML. Artwork exports include the full key art, approved series identity, landscape share layout, portrait layout, and the artwork brief.

Accessibility and practical support

Source pins remain beside writing on larger screens and inline on phones. Key terms support focus and tap. The offline file works without external assets. Students who prefer paper can use the Printable Notebook alongside the game and Source Companion; branch outcomes still come from the game. Arrange alternatives based on the actual access need rather than requiring a smaller-screen workflow.

Release 2.2 / October 2026. The prior simulated review report is supplied as design documentation, with its simulation status disclosed.