Whose Terms?

Teaching review · 26 October 2026

STUDENT PACKET / QUICK START

Open the notebook.

Evidence and revision

Use Test your explanation beneath the question. Which source can support which part? helps you choose evidence; explain its relevance in your existing answer. When revising, open Compare with my first recorded reason. A source opened while writing offers Return to my draft, preserving your place. These tools add no extra response.

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.

Follow the story. Test the account.

Begin with what brought people to this decision. Identify what each person wants, what they fear losing, and who has the power to act. Follow how earlier choices affect the next file.

Understanding someone’s perspective does not make every claim accurate. Use the evidence checks to distinguish a supported claim, a misleading omission, a contradiction, and something the sources cannot establish. A disagreement about what is fair is a different question from a factual error.

Use your existing responses to connect a rule to its human consequences. Keep historical evidence, the author’s interpretation, and the game’s invented people and outcomes distinct.

Advise a fictional Palestinian civic committee through documented circumstances in 1920-1936. Then enter a present-day workshop to inspect a 1939 policy and test one model rule. Your task is to explain a relationship between political rules, public work, and available choices.

1 / Begin with a usable setup

• Open index.html in a current browser, or use the case page. Choose For class for assigned work and enter the name your instructor expects. Just for learning retains the full investigation with optional writing, an optional name, and no submission.

• Allow 90-120 minutes of active work. Plan a break after encounter 9. This is a planning estimate, not a deadline or a speed score.

• All background, definitions, and source cards needed for the tasks are included. Prior reading is not required; your instructor may assign the book separately.

2 / Use one small cycle

Read the Situation. Open the Evidence. Decide on a route. Explain your reasoning and attach a source where requested. Then read the designed consequence. Most responses can be short; write enough to explain the mechanism, rather than padding a word count.

Pin the source you need before writing. On a phone the reference stays in an inline panel; on a wider screen it sits beside the response. Tap or focus underlined glossary terms for an in-place definition.

3 / Keep the two layers distinct

Blue HISTORICAL SOURCES identifies the source layer: documented records, data, or an author’s interpretation, labeled by type. The warm COMMITTEE MODEL layer shows your invented committee’s proposals and designed outcomes. A model consequence cannot independently prove a historical argument.

The full class route has 18 short explanations plus two after-outcome reflections. The minimum response total is 330 words; the counters check length, not quality.

Keep a portable copy.

Pause after encounter 9

Complete the checkpoint and export your JSON progress file before stepping away. If the download is blocked, use the manual progress-text backup offered on screen. Confirm that you have kept the file or text. A download request alone does not prove it reached your device.

Return without losing your record

• Use the same browser and address when possible. Browser storage can be cleared and is not a substitute for a backup.

• To move between the online and downloaded copies, devices, browsers, or file locations, export JSON first. Open the new copy and use its progress-import control to load that JSON.

• Your JSON save contains your name and responses. Keep it as you would other coursework.

Notice a reason that changes

At encounters 12 and 18, the simulation asks you to compare your first recorded reason with what you say after seeing the outcome. A post-facto rationalization is a reason added after an outcome that is then presented as if it guided the original choice. Revising a view can be good reasoning: identify what changed and whether the basis was historical evidence or the designed result. The activity does not diagnose bias or reward stubborn consistency.

Finish and submit

Export a readable response record using the game’s print/PDF, HTML, or text options. Inspect the exported record and submit the format your instructor requests through the course system. Keep the JSON backup as well. The simulation does not submit automatically to Canvas.

A useful explanation

Name a rule or institution → explain how it shapes an actor’s options → cite a relevant source → state a limit or an observation that could change your account.

You may qualify or challenge Khalidi’s explanation. Represent it accurately, use evidence, and make the alternative clear. There is no hidden statehood victory or required political conclusion.

Companion files: Source Companion, Printable Notebook, and the offline index.html simulation. The printable notebook accompanies the browser activity; it does not reproduce every branch or replace the historical evidence.