THE COMMON FUND

Palestine, 1905–1948 · Class worksheet

Based on Gershon Shafir and Yoav Peled, Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship (Cambridge University Press, 2002). A Whose Terms? investigation. Created by Yoav Duman.

Role in the historical simulation: Zionist decision-maker advising a fictional Jewish cooperative. The cooperative is constructed; the national project and historical setting are not fictional.

Name: _____

Route: Full · 11 decisions

Configured participation

Class settings: Standard class

Required work: decision writing, evidence, explanation checks, reflection pauses, feedback responses, final analysis, new case, source acknowledgment

Writing minima: Decisions 20; analysis 40; new case 30 words when required

Short reflections: 10 words when required

Tasks outside that required-work list are optional; policy choices remain required. Names are required for class and optional in Just for learning.

One fund. Different futures.

It begins with a promise: pool limited resources so a lost job does not leave a household alone. For a Jewish newcomer escaping poverty or antisemitic persecution, a job reserved for Jewish workers can mean a future. For a Palestinian worker already earning a living here, that rule can shut them out of work. Employers, workers, and donors do not share one interest. When funding for the Zionist national project arrives with conditions, the fund must decide whose security it guarantees—and whose voice counts.

Constructed local story; historical context: E01–E04. The people and dialogue are composites, not historical quotations.

You advise successive Zionist cooperative boards as people and political conditions change. Palestinian workers and neighbors have their own rights, aims, and representatives; you do not speak or decide for them. Assess the cooperative’s account and other perspectives against the supplied evidence.

Base costs; earlier agreements can change them in the app.

1. 1905 — A wage is also a boundary

The first file: the fund has not yet promised anyone a job. A grant would turn an immediate wage problem into a lasting membership rule.

Jewish plantation owners often prefer experienced, lower-paid Palestinian crews. Newly arrived European Jewish workers seek higher wages and secure employment. A Zionist donor offers funding reserved for Jewish jobs. Palestinian representatives propose a negotiated wage agreement that also protects existing crews. Your board decides which arrangement to support. The choice connects an immediate livelihood to a rule about future eligibility.

Constructed composite voice — Miriam: I did not come here to remain dependent on whichever employer needs me today. A protected job could let me build a life. If we refuse the grant, what can we promise instead?

Constructed composite voice — Yusuf: These are our jobs too. If the new fund calls them somebody else's national achievement, where does that leave our households? We want our own representatives at the wage negotiations.

Constructed composite voice — Leah: I can enter a grant as income. I also have to enter its condition: some workers will qualify and others will not. Our neighbors will live with both entries.

Claim to test: Protecting Jewish employment is simply a response to workers' hardship.

What the evidence supports: Hardship and antisemitism help explain the demand for security; they do not fully explain the specific exclusion of existing Palestinian crews. E02–E04 also identify national organization, employer interests, and conditional finance.

Evidence cards: E02, E04

How to assess: How does a funding condition change whose work is protected?

Employers' preference for lower-paid crews and workers' demand for secure employment are different interests (E02).

National resources helped sustain protected settlement and employment outside ordinary competition (E04).

Your test: Trace finance → eligibility → job security. Compare an open market with a negotiated wage agreement; neither label alone guarantees protection.

Keep the claim this size: This local contract cannot establish every employer's behavior, equal political standing or sovereignty.

Further evidence: Dated hiring contracts, payrolls and workers' agreements could test how the mechanism operated.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Accept the protected employment grant · 5 base tokens

Rule: Funded jobs are reserved for Jewish workers

( ) Leave hiring to each employer · 0 base tokens

Rule: Employers set hiring and wages without a common guarantee

( ) Fund a negotiated wage and job agreement · 8 base tokens

Rule: Covered jobs require a negotiated wage and protection for existing crews

Explanation check: A donor funds only Jewish-reserved jobs, while planters prefer lower-paid Palestinian crews. Which explanation connects the two facts?

( ) Workers use national finance to protect higher-paid employment by creating a national eligibility boundary.

( ) Planters adopt the workers' preferred wage because their existing labor-cost interests have changed.

( ) The fund protects both crews through a common wage agreement negotiated with their representatives.

Explain your decision

Named people: Miriam — Newly arrived Jewish laborer; Yusuf — Palestinian agricultural worker; Leah — Cooperative bookkeeper.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E02 and E04, explain why Miriam wants protection and how your rule affects Yusuf’s job access. What does a hardship-only explanation leave out?

Evidence selected: _____

2. 1911 — Read the small print

Six years later, a lease offers the fund a more secure base. The land is already part of other people’s working lives.

A national landholding body offers your cooperative a lease. Its conditions reserve future leases and employment for Jews. Palestinian tenants already cultivate part of the tract and demand protection for their livelihoods. The board can accept, decline, or seek a smaller agreement with consenting tenants. Signing with the owner does not establish the tenants’ consent or erase their occupancy claims.

Constructed composite voice — Salma: You have a signature from the owner. I need to know whether we can keep cultivating and living here. Give us the terms and let us decide; do not count a promised benefit as our agreement.

Constructed composite voice — David: Without a lasting lease, every improvement feels temporary. I want us to put down roots. But a future secured for us can become a future closed to somebody already here.

Constructed composite voice — Esther: Our contributors expect the land to remain available to the Jewish national project. That is the purpose of this offer. Your board can refuse the terms; it cannot spend our money as if the conditions did not exist.

Claim to test: If a purchase or lease is legal, everyone affected has agreed to it.

What the evidence supports: An owner’s agreement is not a cultivator’s consent. E03 shows how a market transaction can establish lasting national restrictions; it does not establish that every purchase had identical consequences.

Evidence cards: E03

How to assess: Who can stay, work and contest the terms after this land agreement?

A nationally restricted lease can bind later leases and employment (E03).

An owner’s agreement, a tenant’s occupancy claim and a tenant’s consent are different evidence.

Your test: Hold this tract fixed. Compare who qualifies under each rule, which agreement binds the board and what tenants could claim.

Keep the claim this size: The cooperative cannot repeal an external land restriction by granting a separate local benefit.

Further evidence: The lease terms, occupancy records, tenant agreements and enforceable remedies would test the specific claim.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Accept the national lease conditions · 5 base tokens

Rule: Land and covered employment remain within national eligibility rules

( ) Decline and pause the expansion · 0 base tokens

Rule: No expansion contract is signed without tenant negotiations

( ) Negotiate an occupancy and use compact · 8 base tokens

Rule: Cooperative expansion requires tenant consent and enforceable occupancy protections

Explanation check: A tract is bought legally. Which additional finding most clearly shows how the purchase can produce durable national separation?

( ) National restrictions bind future leases and employment even when a new cooperative takes over.

( ) The cooperative invests in crops and buildings that give its members a long-term stake.

( ) Tenant cultivators were not parties to the owner's agreement.

Explain your decision

Named people: Salma — Palestinian tenant cultivator; David — Cooperative agronomist; Esther — National fund liaison.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Use E03 to test the claim that the owner’s signature settles Salma’s consent. Explain what your rule changes for her cultivation and for David’s security.

Evidence selected: _____

Reflection pause 1

Compare your hiring and land decisions. How does one rule extend, limit, or contradict the other’s protection of livelihoods?

3. 1912 — The same nation, a different queue

The fund can draw a national boundary and still divide the people inside it. New demands expose the difference between belonging and equal standing.

Jewish workers from Yemen request equal wages, housing, and plots. Historically, organizers recruited them as lower-paid replacements for Palestinian labor while giving European Jewish workers greater support. Racialized labels presented Europeans as idealistic pioneers and Yemenites as naturally suited to hardship. These judgments ranked national contribution and justified unequal resources. Your board must decide whether common Jewish belonging brings equal standing.

Constructed composite voice — Shalom: They recruited us to work here, then said our families could live on less. We are not asking to be praised. We want the same wage guarantee and housing standard—and a say in setting it.

Constructed composite voice — Rivka: My household planned around the housing already promised. I do not want equality to become another promise nobody receives. Show us how the same wage and housing rules can be funded; do not call our current priority natural.

Constructed composite voice — Noa: Everyone on this list may be Jewish, but the columns beside their names are different. If we keep those columns, we should say who created them and whose judgment they serve.

Claim to test: Yemenite workers naturally need less and therefore deserve a smaller package.

What the evidence supports: This is a racialized justification, not evidence of workers' abilities or needs. E08 connects unequal wages, housing, and plots to how organizers ranked contribution and controlled resources.

Evidence cards: E08

How to assess: How can shared national belonging coexist with unequal standing?

E08 describes unequal wages, housing and plots among Jewish workers.

The book examines racialized classifications of pioneering contribution; those labels are not evidence of innate ability.

Your test: Separate inclusion in the national category from the ranking that allocates wages, housing, land and authority.

Keep the claim this size: Equalizing this schedule does not automatically change a different hiring or land-eligibility rule.

Further evidence: Allocation records and the criteria used to credit contributions could test the institutional ranking.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Keep the inherited graded schedule · 4 base tokens

Rule: Origin and presumed pioneering contribution affect wages and housing

( ) Replace guarantees with individual piece rates · 0 base tokens

Rule: Workers receive individual contracts without common housing guarantees

( ) Adopt equal guarantees and shared oversight · 8 base tokens

Rule: Covered workers receive equal wage and housing standards with elected oversight

Explanation check: European and Yemenite Jewish workers both contribute labor but receive different housing and access to public land. Which finding best supports a republican-ranking explanation?

( ) The groups have different migration histories and different experience in local organizations.

( ) The allocating body credits one group with idealistic pioneering sacrifice and describes the other as naturally suited to hardship.

( ) Both groups are recruited as members of the Jewish national population.

Explain your decision

Named people: Shalom — Yemenite Jewish agricultural worker; Rivka — European Jewish cooperative member; Noa — Housing committee clerk.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Use E08 to distinguish Shalom’s national belonging from his institutional rank. Which part of the claim about “natural” needs is unsupported, and what does your rule change?

Evidence selected: _____

4. 1920 — A union that is more than a union

Ottoman rule has ended; Britain now governs. The Histadrut is founded in 1920, and its economic and social network will develop over the following years.

The Histadrut, founded in 1920, links labor organization with developing economic and social institutions. Affiliation offers your cooperative useful services and access to national resources. It also places decisions within a network whose leaders control valuable benefits. Palestinian workers organize independently and do not necessarily seek incorporation into that project. Decide how your fund will secure services and distribute authority.

Constructed composite voice — Rachel: A job office, credit, and care linked together could change what our families can count on. I want that protection. I also want to know what happens to a member who challenges the leadership.

Constructed composite voice — Khalil: Our members can negotiate services without joining your national project. A consultation desk is not equal authority. We choose our delegates and the limits of what they can agree to.

Constructed composite voice — Eliyahu: We are trying to build more than a bargaining office. A Jewish workers' society needs institutions that last. A regional arrangement may provide something useful, but it is not the same political project.

Claim to test: A union that improves workers' lives necessarily represents every worker on equal terms.

What the evidence supports: Valuable provision can coexist with national exclusion and concentrated leadership. E06 and E22 explain both the attraction of the network and its limits; Khalil's independent organization is not a lack of political agency.

Evidence cards: E06, E22

How to assess: What does affiliation provide, and who controls the resulting claim?

The Histadrut network linked labor representation with employment, enterprises and services (E06).

E22 distinguishes valuable achievements, leadership and control of national resources; Palestinian national aims remained outside that project.

Your test: Identify the published eligibility rule, the benefit a person could claim, and who can refuse or review it. Separate this from personal loyalty.

Keep the claim this size: Palestinian organizations can pursue independent aims; the fund cannot authorize their incorporation on their behalf.

Further evidence: Membership rules, service guarantees, bargaining agreements and appeal records could test the claim.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Join through nationally bounded membership · 5 base tokens

Rule: Services and cooperative representation follow national affiliation

( ) Remain an independent contracting office · 0 base tokens

Rule: The fund sells limited services without a shared membership package

( ) Negotiate a regional service association · 8 base tokens

Rule: Regional services require equal user representation and independent worker organization

Explanation check: Which observation best distinguishes an institutional social right from an individual loyalty gift?

( ) Recipients identify more strongly with the leadership after obtaining clinic services.

( ) National funds support a clinic administered through a centralized organizational network.

( ) People occupying published eligible positions can claim a defined benefit without obtaining a personal favor from an official.

Explain your decision

Named people: Rachel — Cooperative delegate; Khalil — Palestinian worker organizer; Eliyahu — Affiliation advocate.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E06 and E22, explain why Rachel finds affiliation attractive and why Khalil may seek cooperation without incorporation. What does your rule offer, and what power remains unequal?

Evidence selected: _____

5. 1923 — The clinic door

Provision reaches the clinic door. A patient’s need, a household’s dues, and membership in a national institution are different grounds for a claim.

Your clinic serves members, dependents, and patients outside the membership list. Renewal requires a rule about who can claim care and challenge refusal. Three claimants invoke different grounds: national belonging, contribution to the common project, and individual rights. These grounds can combine. Choose your clinic’s rule, then examine whose claim it accepts and who can enforce it.

Constructed composite voice — Hanna: The person waiting at the door is ill now. I need a rule that tells me what care they can claim, not which official might do them a favor.

Constructed composite voice — Farid: An occasional appointment is welcome, but tomorrow another administrator can say no. Publish what people can claim, let us challenge refusals, and include us in deciding how the clinic runs.

Constructed composite voice — Bracha: People paid dues when money was tight because they expected care when they needed it. If we extend the guarantee, I have to explain how we will keep that promise to everyone covered.

Claim to test: A clinic open to everyone at the same price gives everyone equal practical access.

What the evidence supports: Equal posted prices do not establish ability to pay or an enforceable entitlement. E19–E21 also show that a real social right for members need not cover every inhabitant.

Evidence cards: E19, E21

How to assess: On what ground can this person claim care and challenge refusal?

National belonging, recognized contribution and individual rights are distinct grounds that can combine (E19).

An eligible person’s social entitlement differs from a posted treatment price or discretionary favor (E21).

Your test: Name who qualifies, what care is guaranteed and who can require a correction after refusal. A common fund alone does not identify the ground.

Keep the claim this size: A defined clinic claim does not settle every person’s employment, land claim or political standing.

Further evidence: Eligibility rules, the guaranteed package, fees and actual appeal decisions could test effective access.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Guarantee care through existing membership · 4 base tokens

Rule: Clinic entitlements follow recognized fund membership and dues

( ) Keep only a fee-paying basic service · 0 base tokens

Rule: Clinic use depends on payment with no common sickness guarantee

( ) Create a local entitlement based on need · 8 base tokens

Rule: Covered local residents have a needs-based clinic claim and an appeal

Citizenship claims: identify the ground invoked by each claim.

Use these terms: Ethno-national; Republican; Liberal.

I belong to the Jewish nation. — _____

My pioneering work earns priority. — _____

Each person has a right to care. — _____

Explain your decision

Named people: Hanna — Clinic nurse; Farid — Palestinian service-user representative; Bracha — Cooperative dues collector.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E19 or E21, explain Farid’s account of the clinic door. Distinguish two grounds for care, including why formal eligibility alone may not make treatment usable.

Evidence selected: _____

Reflection pause 2

Using E08 or E19, explain why membership does not necessarily mean equal resources or an enforceable claim.

6. 1927 — Who audits the pioneers?

Women’s national voting rights have widened, but local influence remains uneven. In 1927 the Women Workers’ Council loses its more independent leadership.

Women in the labor movement gained voting rights but still struggled for independent authority. In 1927, the more independent leadership of the Women Workers’ Council was defeated. Pioneering prestige privileged work coded as masculine; care could sustain the project without earning equal standing. Your board faces demands for transparent budgets, recognition of care, and representatives able to challenge leadership.

Constructed composite voice — Tamar: After the work and the care are done, who has time to attend? Give us the accounts, support to participate, and a way to challenge a budget. A seat without those powers can leave us thanking the same officials.

Constructed composite voice — Shalom: We can vote and still arrive at an appeal before the people who wrote the unequal wage and housing rules. Let our representatives question the standard, not just ask for a better place under it.

Constructed composite voice — Moshe: I know how many promises can fail when nobody coordinates the work. Independent review may slow us down. But experience cannot give my office the final word on complaints against itself.

Claim to test: Giving women votes and services means they already have equal authority.

What the evidence supports: E09 and E20 distinguish participation and valuable provision from control over budgets and appeals. Neither a vote nor childcare alone establishes equal influence; women organizers also disagreed over independence and loyalty.

Evidence cards: E09, E20

How to assess: Does this rule change provision, recognition or enforceable authority?

E09 examines women’s contribution and unequal pioneering recognition.

E20 distinguishes political inclusion from effective control over budgets and decisions.

Your test: Compare a vote or advisory seat with access to records, independent representation and a ruling that binds the executive.

Keep the claim this size: Better care or representation does not by itself establish equal control over every institution.

Further evidence: Budget powers, appointment rules and implemented review decisions could test whether authority changed.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Entrust reform to the established leadership · 4 base tokens

Rule: The executive retains final control over audits and allocation appeals

( ) Publish the accounts, defer structural reform · 0 base tokens

Rule: Care work is recognized and accounts are public; the executive retains final authority over agendas and appeals

( ) Create an independent audit and representation charter · 8 base tokens

Rule: Independent review, protected representation, and paid participation constrain the executive

Explanation check: Women can vote and receive childcare, but officials still set budgets and hear all appeals. Which new fact most clearly shows changed authority rather than only better provision?

( ) Independent representatives can obtain budget records and enforce a ruling against the executive.

( ) More women receive childcare under the same allocation and appeal rules.

( ) More women sit on an advisory committee whose recommendations the executive may decline.

Explain your decision

Named people: Tamar — Women workers’ organizer; Shalom — Yemenite Jewish member delegate; Moshe — Long-serving cooperative administrator.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Use E09 or E20 to explain Tamar’s demand fairly. Test the claim that votes and services already establish equal authority. What power does your rule change?

Evidence selected: _____

7. 1933 — Scarcity is not the whole explanation

The local accounts show a shortfall. Outside the fund, the historical timing offers a test: exclusion campaigns intensified even as unemployment declined.

Your cooperative faces a local shortfall. A national grant offers stability if covered jobs remain exclusive. Yet the historical evidence complicates scarcity as an explanation: campaigns against Arab employment intensified in 1932–1936 amid prosperity and falling unemployment. The Histadrut also faced rival organizations. Choose a response, then test which explanation best fits the historical pattern.

Constructed composite voice — Leah: Our fund is short of money, but that does not explain every campaign against Palestinian workers. Before we call exclusion unavoidable, compare the grant's conditions with the employment figures and political rivals.

Constructed composite voice — Yusuf: We hear that there is no room for us, even when jobs are growing. Whose position does this restriction protect? Let us examine the rule, not only the fear attached to it.

Constructed composite voice — Rivka: I cannot treat a lost clinic or wage guarantee as a small cost. Still, I want the donor to answer for the condition. Keeping our services and keeping jobs exclusive are not the same promise.

Claim to test: The exclusion campaigns intensified because there were simply too few jobs.

What the evidence supports: E11 weakens a scarcity-only explanation: campaigns intensified amid prosperity and falling unemployment, alongside organizational rivalry. This does not make household insecurity irrelevant or prove a single motive for every participant.

Evidence cards: E11

Evidence window: Present-day evidence window: E11 assesses 1932–1936. Use it to test the historical explanation; those later years were not information available to this 1933 board. The fund's shortfall is invented.

How to assess: Does scarcity alone explain the historical exclusion campaign?

E11 describes campaigns that intensified amid prosperity and falling unemployment.

The book also identifies competition over organization and Zionist leadership; this is not proof of one motive for every participant.

Your test: Ask what scarcity alone predicts when unemployment falls, then compare the observed campaign. Keep the fictional fund's shortfall separate.

Keep the claim this size: The historical pattern weakens a scarcity-only account; it does not show that household insecurity was unreal.

Further evidence: Matched dates and places, employment data and organizational records would help distinguish the explanations.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Accept a renewed exclusive employment package · 5 base tokens

Rule: New national support requires renewed exclusive employment conditions

( ) Contract operations to the existing reserve · 0 base tokens

Rule: No new grant is accepted; services and employment contracts shrink

( ) Recharter and finance a broader service agreement · 8 base tokens

Rule: New dues support covered workers through a jointly negotiated service charter

Explanation check: The fund's invented shortfall makes scarcity seem plausible. Which historical finding most weakens a scarcity-only explanation of the 1932–1936 exclusion campaigns?

( ) Campaigns intensified amid declining unemployment and prosperity, while rivals were challenged over their claims to Zionist leadership.

( ) Jewish workers sought dependable jobs and wages sufficient to support their households.

( ) Jewish planters had preferred lower-paid Palestinian labor when deciding whom to hire.

Explain your decision

Named people: Leah — Cooperative bookkeeper; Yusuf — Palestinian worker representative; Rivka — Cooperative member.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E11, test the scarcity-only account of Yusuf’s exclusion. Explain why Rivka’s need for services can be real even when that account is insufficient.

Evidence selected: _____

8. 1936 — An audit under pressure

The general strike and revolt begin in 1936. Demands about country, land, and political authority exceed anything a local service charter can settle.

The Palestinian general strike and revolt begin in 1936, challenging British rule and Zionist settlement. Your board cannot settle that struggle, but it can audit the rules already on its books. Examine jobs, land, benefits, and representation together. A rule may exclude people from membership, rank those included, or do both. Decide what the audit can change.

Constructed composite voice — Salma: A fairer clinic rule can matter to a household. It does not answer who controls our country or what happens to our land. Do not enter our national demands as a service problem you have solved.

Constructed composite voice — Tamar: Count the services, and then read the minutes. Who could set the priorities? Who could overturn a refusal? An improved benefit can leave the same people deciding everything.

Constructed composite voice — Shalom: We have heard that we all belong. Show what changed in the schedule and whose challenge the board had to obey. A new statement of respect will not pay the old difference.

Claim to test: Fairer services inside the fund settle the wider conflict over land and political authority.

What the evidence supports: Local reform can protect a defined claim while leaving national land restrictions and colonial rule intact. E03 and E08 also distinguish exclusion from the lower standing of people already included.

Evidence cards: E03, E08

How to assess: Which rules exclude outsiders, rank members or do both?

E03 addresses durable national restrictions in land and employment.

E08 describes unequal recognition and resources within the Jewish national category.

Your test: Compare Salma’s eligibility with Shalom’s position among members, then trace one concrete consequence and who could change it.

Keep the claim this size: A local rights charter cannot by itself repeal an external lease or the colonial government’s powers.

Further evidence: The exact charter, external contracts and implementation records could show which protection changed.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Consolidate the national service institution · 4 base tokens

Rule: The fund preserves national eligibility and central allocation with a public audit

( ) Separate services from the governing board · 0 base tokens

Rule: The board transfers direct services and retains an accountable contracts and claims office

( ) Adopt a local rights and accountability charter · 8 base tokens

Rule: A local charter binds service eligibility, occupancy protections, and independent review

Explanation check: A local charter broadens clinic eligibility, but external land leases remain nationally restricted and British authorities retain political power. Which assessment follows?

( ) The charter changes a defined local entitlement while distinct land restrictions and colonial political constraints remain operative.

( ) Because the board cannot change sovereignty, its clinic promise can count only as charity rather than a right.

( ) Broader clinic access establishes that the overall citizenship regime has been transformed.

Explain your decision

Named people: Salma — Palestinian cultivator representative; Tamar — Women workers’ organizer; Shalom — Yemenite Jewish member delegate.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E03 or E08, distinguish Salma’s exclusion claim from Shalom’s unequal rank. Explain why a local reform can matter without settling the political conflict.

Evidence selected: _____

9. 1939 — Capacity has a history

Three years of revolt and repression have changed what organizations can do. The file carries unequal institutional histories forward, rather than beginning from a level field.

During the 1936–1939 revolt, British repression disrupted Palestinian leadership. The strike also reshaped the economy: Jewish replacement labor strengthened the Histadrut's control of labor supply, while enterprises increasingly turned toward national finance. These processes gave organizations unequal capacities. Your board now reviews emergency arrangements, including whose representatives and records survive. Its choices operate within these wider constraints.

Constructed composite voice — Khalil: An organization cannot meet freely when its leaders are removed. Do not describe the resulting weakness as our people's character. Keep our delegates' authority and our members' records separate from your judgment of our capacity.

Constructed composite voice — Rachel: The network kept services running for households like mine. That is why people support it. But if the emergency never ends on the books, when can a member challenge the arrangements made in its name?

Constructed composite voice — Leah: A new form can lose an old claim in a single blank box. Keep the tenancy and employment records even when the service list changes; people may need them after this office is reorganized.

Claim to test: Stronger institutions prove that one people was inherently better able to organize.

What the evidence supports: E13 identifies historical processes: British repression disrupted Palestinian leadership while replacement labor and national finance strengthened other capacities. Need, effort, and organizational opportunity are not interchangeable.

Evidence cards: E13

How to assess: Which historical processes produced unequal organizing opportunities?

E13 describes British repression of Palestinian leadership during the 1936–1939 revolt.

It also connects replacement labor and national finance to stronger labor institutions. These are historical processes, not innate capacities.

Your test: Trace coercion, labor supply and finance separately. Ask how each affected the organization's resources and ability to act.

Keep the claim this size: The fund's administrative package cannot repair every consequence of colonial repression or supply a population's political mandate.

Further evidence: Dated organizational, financial and repression records would help compare the specific mechanisms.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Renew the central emergency service package · 5 base tokens

Rule: Emergency services follow existing national membership under central administration

( ) End the emergency package, retain basic records · 0 base tokens

Rule: Basic records survive but common emergency services and representation lose support

( ) Fund relief with independent safeguards · 8 base tokens

Rule: Local emergency aid preserves claimant records and independent user representation

Explanation check: E13 describes British deportation of Palestinian leaders; the book also describes stronger Yishuv labor provision and national finance. What comparison does this evidence support?

( ) Repression increased relief needs, giving the two populations comparable routes to building central institutions.

( ) Prior organization explains the resource difference, so colonial repression can be left out of the institutional account.

( ) Access to finance and accumulated institutions operated alongside unequal coercion to produce different organizational capacities.

Explain your decision

Named people: Khalil — Palestinian worker organizer; Rachel — Cooperative delegate; Leah — Cooperative bookkeeper.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E13, explain Khalil’s organizing constraints and Rachel’s institutional resources. Correct an account that treats unequal capacity as an innate quality of either population.

Evidence selected: _____

10. Late 1947 — Emergency power is still a rule

The UN recommends partition in November 1947. War develops before British rule ends; a recommendation is not an implemented settlement or a guarantee of safe access.

In November 1947, the UN recommends partition; war develops before the Mandate ends. The recommendation does not establish an implemented settlement. Your fund must distribute emergency supplies. Established membership rolls offer a ready-made system but omit people with urgent needs and separate tenancy claims. Decide who can claim assistance and whether receiving it can require surrendering another claim.

Constructed composite voice — Hanna: A patient cannot wait while we decide whether an old list describes their life. Publish the emergency package and the grounds for refusal. Need should not become a negotiation over another claim.

Constructed composite voice — Farid: People need food and treatment now. That need does not give the desk permission to take a tenancy waiver. Give claimants copies they can keep and obtain again.

Constructed composite voice — Eliyahu: Existing rolls let us move supplies quickly. Replacing them takes work. But an empty space on our list is not proof that a household has no need—or no claim outside this program.

Claim to test: Being absent from a service membership list means a person has no valid tenancy claim.

What the evidence supports: In this constructed case, a service roll records service eligibility, not tenancy, ownership, or consent; those claims need relevant evidence. Historical check: E14 establishes that partition was a recommendation, not an implemented settlement.

Evidence cards: E14

How to assess: What does a service roll establish, and which claim lies outside it?

E14 supplies the historical partition recommendation; it does not establish implemented borders or protection.

The witnessed tenancy document and clinic dispute are constructed case facts, not a named historical family’s file.

Your test: Compare service eligibility with tenancy evidence and consent. Use E14 for the recommendation-versus-implementation distinction, not as proof of this tenancy.

Keep the claim this size: The local board cannot decide sovereignty, command armed groups or implement refugee return.

Further evidence: Relevant tenancy records, a valid adjudication and evidence of implementation would be needed for the particular claim.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Route emergency provision through membership · 5 base tokens

Rule: Emergency supplies follow recognized membership and its inherited eligibility rules

( ) Use a small discretionary relief desk · 0 base tokens

Rule: A small emergency desk grants aid case by case without an enforceable claim

( ) Guarantee defined relief and protect claims · 8 base tokens

Rule: Emergency assistance follows need and cannot require surrender of tenancy or property claims

Explanation check: A displaced tenant is absent from the current service roll but supplies a witnessed tenancy document. Why preserve a separate claim record?

( ) The document may support a tenancy claim outside service eligibility, so its record should survive changes to the service roll.

( ) Registering tenancy evidence should wait until the claimant obtains current service membership.

( ) A single membership list is a sufficient proxy when families possess different kinds of tenancy evidence.

Explain your decision

Named people: Hanna — Clinic nurse; Farid — Palestinian claimant representative; Eliyahu — Cooperative supply coordinator.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E14 and an earlier rule, explain who can claim aid through Hanna’s clinic. Correct one inference from a membership list or partition recommendation that the evidence cannot support.

Evidence selected: _____

11. Late 1948 — The new state inherits more than files

Late 1948: the fund’s archive continues, but war, the Nakba, blocked return, and new state powers have transformed people’s ability to use it.

Israel is declared in May 1948. Palestinians experience the Nakba: expulsion, flight, dispossession, and blocked return. Your cooperative now operates within the new state. December regulations place covered absentee property under a state custodian; military controls restrict many remaining Palestinians’ movement. Earlier fund rules persist alongside these new powers. Decide how services and claimant records cross the transition.

Constructed composite voice — Salma: Record that we were forced away, not that we agreed to give up our home. Keep our account with the tenancy evidence. A file that survives is important, but I still cannot live in a file.

Constructed composite voice — Shalom: We are told this is a new beginning. I want to see whose housing application moves first and who can challenge that decision. The old schedule may have a new official at its head.

Constructed composite voice — Tamar: Keep people alive and keep their statements intact. We cannot turn providing aid into permission to settle somebody else’s ownership claim. Ask what this office can enforce and whose authority is still missing.

Claim to test: A displaced person’s absence means consent to losing home, land, or another claim.

What the evidence supports: Absence does not establish consent. E16 traces displacement into administrative control of property; E18 shows continuing military restrictions. Preserving a claim is still different from implementing return, title, or restitution.

Evidence cards: E16, E18

How to assess: What persisted from the fund, and what changed with new state powers?

E16 discusses the December 1948 property regulations; the later 1950 law is outside this playable stage.

E18 addresses military control beginning in 1948. Absence is not evidence that a displaced person consented to losing a claim.

Your test: Name the institution enforcing each rule. Compare an inherited eligibility rule with a new property or movement power; separate keeping a claim from providing a remedy.

Keep the claim this size: A local benefit or preserved document does not itself restore title, movement, return or consent.

Further evidence: The relevant classification, order, ownership or tenancy evidence, review and implemented remedy would test a particular case.

Read all cards named in the prompt; attach one reference and explain both when asked.

Choose a rule

( ) Continue aid through the recognized membership roll · 4 base tokens

Rule: State-era cooperative benefits retain the old membership and priority categories

( ) Preserve the archive, suspend common benefits · 0 base tokens

Rule: Claimant files survive but the fund no longer guarantees common benefits

( ) Bind relief to a rights-preserving claims charter · 8 base tokens

Rule: Local aid follows need; records preserve absent claimants and independent review constrains the fund

Explanation check: Which account best explains both institutional continuity and the 1948 change in power?

( ) New state institutions asserted equality, so formal commitments displaced earlier eligibility and rank as explanations of access.

( ) New state powers operated alongside inherited networks and classifications, while displacement and blocked return transformed Palestinian access and claims.

( ) Earlier networks survived, so their organizational continuity is sufficient to explain the new setting without examining state powers.

Explain your decision

Named people: Salma — Displaced Palestinian cultivator; written representation in the case file; Shalom — Yemenite Jewish member delegate; Tamar — Women workers' organizer.

Hint: State your rule. Trace who gains a claim, who remains outside or faces a trade-off, and what the source can establish. Apply one correction or distinction after discussing the check.

Using E16 or E18, explain Salma's account and correct the inference that absence means consent. Compare an inherited fund rule with a new state power affecting her access.

Evidence selected: _____

Explain your institution

Use two connected rules and two source cards to explain who gains protection and who has less access or authority. Reconstruct one person's reasoning fairly, then correct one misleading claim with evidence. Distinguish understanding a position from accepting its factual claims.

New case — The Founders' Service Fund

A contemporary city creates a housing and childcare fund after a flood. Read these three fictional records and apply one mechanism from your game.

A · Charter

Housing priority goes to recognized founding volunteers. The founders’ committee decides which contributions qualify and sets each member’s benefit.

B · Work log

Paid cleaners, migrant workers, and residents doing unpaid care contributed substantial rebuilding work. Several are missing from the founders’ list. Committee members receive the first housing offers.

C · Complaints

The founders’ committee allocates housing and hears complaints against its own decisions. No independent body can require it to revise an allocation.

Explain how the fund turns recognized contribution into housing priority and authority. Link this to one rule from your game. Propose one enforceable change.

What can these records establish about the city fund?

( ) Recognized contribution creates a hierarchy; no ethnic or national membership rule has been supplied.

( ) The volunteer hierarchy establishes an ethno-national boundary without further evidence.

( ) Because the fund is local, its rules cannot distribute rights or authority.

Historical source cards and references

E01 — A national project in an inhabited country

Shafir and Peled analyze Labor Zionism as a settlement movement seeking a Jewish demographic majority and institutions for a Jewish nation-state. Palestinian Arabs already lived, worked, and cultivated land there. Their resistance concerned control of their country, land, and livelihoods. Jewish migrants also sought refuge from poverty, oppression, and antisemitism.

Evidence type: Historical context and authors' interpretation

Limits and distinctions: The Common Fund and its committee are invented teaching devices; there was no single committee controlling Palestine's future.

Source locator: Printed pp. 37–39

E02 — Employers and workers did not share one interest

Jewish plantation owners often preferred lower-paid Palestinian workers. Organized Eastern European Jewish workers sought higher wages and stable employment. Unable to secure their aims through ordinary competition, workers increasingly demanded a protected Jewish employment sector. This conflict helped turn labor organizing into national institution building.

Evidence type: Historical mechanism

Limits and distinctions: Any wage amounts, job totals, employer preferences by individual, or calculated probabilities in the game are invented unless separately sourced.

Source locator: Printed pp. 38–41

E03 — Open to purchase, closed afterward

The Jewish National Fund bought land through the land market, then retained it as Jewish national property. In the institutional model examined here, its land could be leased only to Jews and could not employ non-Jewish labor. A purchase could therefore change future access rules as well as ownership.

Evidence type: Institutional rule and authors' interpretation

Limits and distinctions: A game rule that prevents later resale models a durable institutional commitment. It must not imply that all land in Palestine was owned by the JNF or that every sale had identical consequences.

Source locator: Printed pp. 39–40, 46–47

Optional counterevidence: A 1931 administration report records a temporary JNF-land lease through the British government for displaced Arab cultivators. A general institutional restriction therefore does not describe every local arrangement. Temporary cultivation also does not establish permanent tenure or consent to displacement.

E04 — Subsidies made a protected sector possible

The World Zionist Organization supplied resources that organized settlers could not raise from their earnings alone. Public land, cooperative organization, and financial support helped sustain settlements and employment outside ordinary market pressures. Dependence on these resources also made distribution rules and political organization powerful.

Evidence type: Historical mechanism

Limits and distinctions: Fund units, budget replenishment, operating costs, and tradeoffs are teaching assumptions. They are not reconstructed historical accounts or British pounds.

Source locator: Printed pp. 39, 41–42, 45–48

E06 — A union, employer, and provider

The Histadrut developed much more than collective bargaining. Its institutional network linked employment, enterprises, cooperatives, health provision, and other services. Its Workers' Society owned and administered economic bodies. This helped create a separate Jewish society whose institutions performed functions later associated with a state.

Evidence type: Institutional history

Limits and distinctions: Do not show the full mature network as already existing in 1905 or present the Histadrut itself as founded before 1920.

Source locator: Printed pp. 40, 47–49

E08 — Shared Jewishness did not mean equal standing

Yemenite Jewish workers were recruited in attempts to replace Palestinian workers but received lower wages and smaller housing and plots than European Jews. Ashkenazi organizers were more successful in obtaining national resources. Racialized distinctions between supposedly idealistic and natural workers justified unequal recognition and access within the Jewish population. The 'idealistic' worker was credited with a qualitative national contribution, while the supposedly 'natural' worker supplied quantity without the same founding credit. Control of national land and finance made this racialized ranking materially effective.

Evidence type: Historical inequality and authors' interpretation

Limits and distinctions: The racialized labels are historical justifications to examine critically, never game descriptions of real abilities. Do not assign innate productivity, preferences, or political beliefs by ethnicity.

Source locator: Printed pp. 74–76

E09 — Work can sustain the institution yet bring little authority

Women participated in settlement and labor, yet the activities conferring pioneering prestige were coded as masculine. Care and reproductive work were treated as support for the national project rather than equal grounds for authority. This makes gender a question about how institutions recognize contribution, not whether women worked or participated.

Evidence type: Authors' gender analysis

Limits and distinctions: A specific women's petition, allocation decision, or 1920s meeting in this game is fictional. These pages do not establish a particular historical vote or quotation.

Source locator: Printed pp. 71, 95–97 The dated 1927 organizing conflict is on printed p. 107; administrative privileges are discussed on p. 64. See also E20.

E11 — Exclusion could serve organizational power

The Histadrut campaigned against Jewish employers' hiring of Arab labor even during prosperity and declining unemployment. Shafir and Peled connect the campaign to competition with citrus growers and Revisionists (a rival Zionist political movement) as well as to national separation. Exclusion cannot therefore be explained only as an automatic response to job scarcity.

Evidence type: Historical finding and authors' explanation

Limits and distinctions: Do not make every exclusion decision a necessary economic response. Model organizational strategy and institutional power as separate reasons actors may support it.

Source locator: Printed p. 41

E13 — Revolt and repression changed institutional capacities

The 1936–1939 Arab Revolt challenged British rule and the Zionist settlement project. British repression disrupted Palestinian leadership: in October 1937 five leaders, four from the Arab Higher Committee, were deported without trial. Shafir and Peled describe how the strike paralyzed public services and parts of the Jewish private economy; Jewish workers replaced strikers. The Histadrut's monopoly in supplying labor strengthened its position. As private capital declined, private enterprises increasingly sought national finance. These were unequal historical processes, not innate differences between populations.

Evidence type: Contemporaneous parliamentary admission plus scholarly institutional analysis

Limits and distinctions: The historical repression and unequal capacities are fixed context, not punishments for a player's allocation choices. Political organizing and colonial repression must remain distinct mechanisms.

Source locator: Hansard, House of Commons, 4 November 1938, vol. 340, cols. 541–542W; Being Israeli, printed pp. 69–70.

E14 — A partition recommendation was not an implemented settlement

UN General Assembly Resolution 181 recommended partition into Arab and Jewish states linked by economic union, with a separate international regime for Jerusalem. The plan included equal protection and minority rights. It proposed a transition and institutions for implementation; adopting the recommendation did not itself establish both states or automatically put those protections into practice.

Evidence type: Primary UN resolution and distinction between recommendation and implementation

Limits and distinctions: Do not present the partition boundaries as actual 1948 borders or a player vote as capable of implementing partition. A proposed right, institutional capacity, and enforced protection are separate.

Source locator: A/RES/181(II), opening recommendation; Plan Part I, A–C, especially B.10 and C, Chapter 2

E16 — Displacement could become administrative dispossession

During the Nakba, Palestinians fled and were expelled, losing homes and livelihoods. In December 1948, emergency regulations defined absentees and vested their property rights in a state custodian (an official administering the property), including in some cases people who had left their normal residence without leaving Palestine. Physical displacement could thus be reinforced by administrative classification and control of property.

Evidence type: Scholarly account plus primary contemporaneous property regulations and UN report

Limits and distinctions: Use the 1948 emergency regulations, not the 1950 Absentees' Property Law. Under the 1948 text the custodian could not transfer immovable ownership or lease it beyond five years; do not offer an unrestricted permanent sale as a documented 1948 power.

Source locator: Being Israeli, printed pp. 17–18, 53, 110–113; UNCCP A/AC.25/W/10, 2 May 1949, introduction and annex regulations 1(a), 5, and 19(b); UN Mediator A/648, Part One VIII.3(e), VIII.4(i)

E18 — Statehood did not end the frontier within

Palestinian communities remaining within Israel faced military administration beginning in 1948. It restricted movement and economic opportunities. Shafir and Peled connect this regime to control of labor, land, and political participation. Becoming a state therefore changed the instruments of exclusion and incorporation; formal promises of equal standing did not eliminate institutionally unequal access.

Evidence type: Scholarly institutional interpretation and dated historical regime

Limits and distinctions: 1966 is an epilogue fact, not a playable 1948 event. Do not claim all remaining Palestinians immediately received nationality under a 1948 law or that all communities experienced identical controls.

Source locator: Being Israeli, printed p. 18 and pp. 110–113

E19 — A real right can still have a boundary

The Histadrut provided substantial social protection for members through mutual self-help, including care, employment-related benefits and housing. These were not simply personal gifts for loyalty: many claims attached to recognized institutional positions. But their coverage and distribution were tied to the labor movement's national-colonial project. A social right for that community did not amount to an equal claim for every inhabitant.

Evidence type: Authors' distinction between social citizenship, relief and patronage

Limits and distinctions: Do not move the 1953 National Insurance Law into a pre-1948 round; use only the pre-state mechanism in playable scenes.

Source locator: Being Israeli (2002), printed pp. 60–65, especially pp. 63 and 65.

E20 — Votes, services, and independent women's authority

The book describes women's organizing for equal participation in pioneering work and their 1925 achievement of unqualified voting and candidacy rights in the Yishuv's national institutions, while local suffrage remained uneven. In the Women Workers' Council, independent feminist and loyalist approaches competed. Ada Maymon's replacement by Golda Meirson in 1927 marked the defeat of the more independent leadership. Family-oriented services did not confer equivalent feminist authority. The authors link this pattern to a gendered distinction between masculine qualitative pioneering and supportive or quantitative care and motherhood.

Evidence type: Historical organizing and authors' gendered-citizenship interpretation

Limits and distinctions: The fictional fund's petition and independent audit charter are not the reported historical event; national suffrage did not establish equal influence in every institution.

Source locator: Being Israeli (2002), printed pp. 101, 106–109; gendered contribution pp. 96–98.

E21 — Three grounds for citizenship claims

The book distinguishes three grounds for citizenship. Liberal claims treat individuals as bearers of equal rights and constrain interference by authorities. Republican claims link standing to participation in a common good and can privilege recognized service. Ethno-national claims ground belonging in a national or ethnic community. These discourses can combine: a nationally bounded institution can rank members' contribution while also recognizing some individual rights. A social entitlement is not automatically liberal, and market access is not the same as an equal right.

Evidence type: Authors' conceptual distinctions and their application

Limits and distinctions: The three recurring menu options must not be mapped one-to-one onto the three discourses. Identify the basis of the claim and the institution that enforces it.

Source locator: Being Israeli (2002), printed pp. 4–6, 42–45, 63–65, 96–98.

E22 — Leadership can rest on achievements and unequal incorporation

Shafir and Peled explain the labor movement's leadership through more than force or personal patronage. Valuable social provision and an effective strategy for building a Jewish nation-state drew support from groups with different interests. Control of national resources and institutions helped make that leadership durable. Yet the project preserved elitist, sectoral and national limits: it promised incorporation while ranking or excluding groups. Palestinian national aspirations remained outside its national project.

Evidence type: Authors' account of hegemony and its limits

Limits and distinctions: Explaining support is not endorsing the project. Popular attraction, organizational control and colonial coercion are different mechanisms, and opportunities were unequal.

Source locator: Being Israeli (2002), printed pp. 66–73; resources and authority pp. 48–50.

Bibliography

Gershon Shafir and Yoav Peled (2002). Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship — Printed pp. 4–6, 17–18, 37–53, 69–76, 95–97, 110–113 of supplied book

His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, submitting the administration report to the League of Nations. Report on the Administration of Palestine and Trans-Jordan for the year 1931 — Introductory paragraph 46; PDF page 18. Temporary lease of 3,200 dunums for 22 months, through the government, for displaced Wadi Hawareth cultivators. | https://israeled.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/1931-LON-Transjordan.pdf

UK Parliament, House of Commons, Malcolm MacDonald, 4 November 1938. Palestine: Deportations, parliamentary written answer — Hansard, vol. 340, cols. 541–542W; answer confirms October 1937 deportations without trial | https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/written-answers/1938/nov/04/deportations

UN General Assembly, 29 November 1947. Resolution 181(II): Future Government of Palestine — Opening recommendation; Plan Part I, A–C | https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/res181.asp

UN Conciliation Commission for Palestine Secretariat, 2 May 1949. Emergency Regulations on Property of Absentees: UNCCP working paper and annexed 1948 text — A/AC.25/W/10, introduction; annex regulations 1(a), 5, 19(b); regulations issued 2 December 1948 | https://unispal.un.org/pdfs/1E1FE62FC7FADC9E85256F9A005927EF.pdf

Sources and model scope

The cooperative, composite speakers, policy alternatives, token costs, and local outcomes are constructed teaching devices. Source cards identify historical evidence. Local service rules do not repeal external land restrictions. The board cannot determine sovereignty, cause or prevent the Nakba, authorize refugee return, or implement all property remedies. Preserving a claim is different from enforcing a remedy.

All illustrations are contemporary interpretive artwork, not historical documents. Historical evidence and the authors’ interpretations are identified separately from constructed local consequences.