"Reacting to the Past" Series

PEDAGOGY MANUAL

Mark C. Carnes
Barnard College
Columbia University

New York Boston San Francisco
London Toronto Sydney Tokyo Singapore Madrid
Mexico City Munich Paris Cape Town Hong Kong Montreal

This work is protected by United States copyright laws and is provided solely for the use of instructors in teaching their courses and assessing student learning. Dissemination or sale of any part of this work (including on the World Wide Web) will destroy the integrity of the work and is not permitted. The work and materials from it should never be made available to students except by instructors using the accompanying text in their classes. All recipients of this work are expected to abide by these restrictions and to honor the intended pedagogical purposes and the needs of other instructors who rely on these materials.

"Reacting to the Past" Pedagogy Manual

Copyright © 2005 by Pearson Education, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. Printed in the United States.

Please visit our website at http://www.ablongman.com

ISBN: 0-321- 33358-6

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10—OPM—07 06 05 04

Contents

PEDAGOGICAL POSSIBILITIES ... 1

General Education Content ... 1
Writing, Speaking, Teamwork, and Leadership Skills ... 1
Building Learning Communities ... 1
Curricular Possibilities ... 2

HOW CAN I LEARN TO TEACH REACTING? ... 2

SHOULD REACTING BE REQUIRED? ... 2

ELEMENTS OF A REACTING GAME ... 3

QUESTIONS ABOUT MANAGEMENT ... 4

How long does a Reacting game last? ... 4
What is the Optimal Length of a Reacting Class? ... 4
Number of students ... 4
Assignments and Grading ... 5
Role of Instructor ... 5

MOTIVATIONAL INDUCEMENTS OF THE REACTING PEDAGOGY ... 6

Escaping from oneself ... 6
Competition ... 7
Teamwork ... 7
Student Empowerment ... 7
The D. W. Griffith Phenomenon: Vicarious engagement with the past ... 8
Taking part in a drama ... 8
Liminal inversions ... 9
Grades ... 9
Conclusion: Psychological Inducements ... 10

TECHNICAL MATTERS IN GAME MANAGEMENT ... 10

Distribution of Roles ... 10
Giving Lectures on Unfamiliar Topics ... 11
The Problem of the Indeterminates ... 11
Design Solutions ... 12
On-going Faculty Guidance and Direction ... 13
The Problem of "Lock-Up" ... 14
Possibilities for Customizing Games ... 15
Historical judgments differ ... 15
Need for variation among Reacting classes ... 16
Faculty involvement ... 16
Playing an Historical Person ... 16
Gender and the dearth of female women figures ... 17
Class Participation ... 18
Best Spaces to Hold Reacting Classes ... 19
Teaching Speaking for Reacting ... 20
Teaching Writing for Reacting ... 21
Guiding Students through Prompt Grading of their Papers ... 22
Small Grade Bonus for "Winning": Pros and Cons ... 22
The Post-Mortem Session ... 23

ILLUSTRATIVE PROBLEMS **24**

If Students Are Confused 24
If a game comes to a halt 25
If student sarcasm wounds 26
If a student becomes obnoxious 27
If a class does not seem to get "into" Reacting 28
If a student feels deceived by the instructor / gM 29
If a student feels deceived by another student 30
If students come to rely too much on a Brilliant Leader 31
If a student declines to play a role for religious or ethical reasons 32
If a game diverges from history 34
If a heated session devolves into chaos 35
If a session becomes weird 36

APPENDIX A: LIST OF CURRENT GAMES **38**

The "reacting to the PasT" Series 38
The Threshold of Democracy: Athens in 403 B.C. *38*
Confucianism and the Succession Crisis of the Wanli emperor, 1587 .... *38*
The Trial of Anne Hutchinson: Liberty, Law, and Intolerance in Puritan New England *39*
Rousseau, Burke, and Revolution in France, 1791 .... *40*
Galileo and the New Cosmology *40*
Defining a Nation: India on the Eve of Independence, 1945 .... *41*
GAMES IN DEVELOPMENT 41
Kansas Board of Education 1999: Evolution and Creationism *41*
The American Revolution in New York City, 1775-76 .... *42*
Henry VIII and the Reformation Parliament *43*

APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONS FOR REACTING PRECEPTORS **44**

Basic 44
"Job Description" 44
Responsibilities 45
Prior to First Game: *45*
First week of first game: Group meeting with all students *45*
Second and Third Week: Individual meeting with each student (first paper) *45*
Fourth and Fifth Week: Individual meetings with each student (problem focus) *46*
Preparation for the Second Game *46*

APPENDIX C: INTRODUCTION TO COURSE AND WRITING ADVISORIES **47**

Introduction to "Reacting to the Past" 48
Writing Advisory #1: On Persuasion and Structure 55
Writing Advisory #2: Coherence 57
Writing Advisory # 3: Lethal Predicates—Not to Be 58
Writing Advisory # 4: People and Things, Pronouns and Nouns 59
Referent *59*
Things You Can See, Touch, Hear, Feel, Smell: *59*
The Power and Pitfalls of Simile and Metaphor *60*
On Rules for Writers: A final note *60*

Pedagogical Possibilities

GENERAL EDUCATION CONTENT

Faculty and students find that "Reacting to the Past" promotes a wide variety of pedagogical purposes. Many of these can be subsumed under the category of general education. At the simplest level, "Reacting" introduces students to "great books" and important ideas in philosophy and religion. Unlike many "great book" courses, however, Reacting shows how ideas emerge from particular historical contexts. It thus teaches historical content. Faculty and administrators can group Reacting games so as to ensure student exposure to a wide range of intellectual and cultural traditions, geographical contexts, disciplinary boundaries, and the like. As more Reacting games are developed and approved, the curricular applications will expand considerably.

WRITING, SPEAKING, TEAMWORK, AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS

Faculty and administrators who are more concerned with skills than general education have also found Reacting to be valuable. Reacting elicits an extraordinarily high degree of student speaking, and elaborate tests have shown that Reacting improves student speaking skills more efficiently than other seminars. Shy students often report that they speak more often in Reacting than in any course they have ever taken.

Some faculty and administrators link Reacting to a writing course, so that the students' writing for their English course also fulfills their objectives in a Reacting game. In short, Reacting motivates students to speak better and to write more effectively and persuasively.

Because the challenges confronting every faction are complex and difficult, students must work closely and cooperatively. As they interact, they learn how to interact; they see, too, the value of teamwork and cooperation in ways that few other courses achieve. Students learn how to lead by doing so themselves and by watching their peers do so.

BUILDING LEARNING COMMUNITIES

The term is so common that often administrators sometimes forget how rarely it is achieved. Reacting builds strong learning communities. Students within factions bond of necessity; the challenge of figuring out the games, determining strategies, and coordinating arguments forces members of a faction to work together. When someone does not show up for class, or fails to step in when another member of the faction is struggling for an answer to a challenging question, or neglects to develop an essential point in a logical chain of arguments—the entire faction will suffer. Factions meet frequently outside of class; and during class, they will sit together and exchange notes.

When adversaries in one game are then put in the SAME faction in the next, they learn far more about each other. Friendships between former adversaries are often extraordinarily deep and close. They are built not on common interests but on an understanding that comes from working with people and also against them.

CURRICULAR POSSIBILITIES

Reacting was conceived as a general education initiative. Some colleges and universities within the Reacting consortium group two or three games to constitute a full-semester course. Some target Reacting for first-year students; others conceive of it as a "capstone" experience limited to juniors and seniors. Some use a single game as the "discussion" section for a lecture course. Some link a Reacting course with a required writing course, or with lecture courses in parallel disciplines (political science, history of religion, history). In short, the curricular possibilities are limitless.

How Can I Learn to Teach Reacting?

This manual reflects the ideas that have been expressed by scores of faculty. But it is important to emphasize that the consensus of faculty who have taught Reacting classes is that the pedagogy is plastic: each instructor, and indeed each class, can and should evolve according to the pedagogical preferences of the instructor. Reacting is fundamentally a strategy to promote psychological engagement: it contains few precise pedagogical formulas.

The best way to learn the workings of the games and their psychological dynamics is to play them. The "Reacting to the Past" Consortium of colleges and universities holds seven or eight conferences a year throughout the nation. At the conferences, faculty and administrators themselves play two-day (mini) versions of different games and discuss the special challenges and possibilities of the pedagogy.

A schedule of conferences for the year is available at the main Reacting website: www.barnard.columbia.edu/Reacting. Funds from the Hesburgh Prize and from FIPSE are used to help defray the costs of the conferences, including food and housing. Those interested in information should inquire at reacting@barnard.edu.

Should Reacting Be Required?

Most students who take Reacting say that it is their most powerful learning experience in college. Attendance is exceptionally strong, and nearly everywhere, Reacting classes receive unprecedentedly high approval ratings from students and faculty alike.

Students get much out of Reacting because they put much into it. Reacting functions through powerful psychological inducements, and these are usually quite successful. But Reacting students sometimes find that their engagement with Reacting is so powerful that they neglect other classes. Word soon gets out that Reacting is sneakily demanding of effort and time. Some students flock to it for that reason, but many others decide that they would prefer a less demanding and more predictable class; they prefer to sit back and take notes than to be expected to deliver speeches and sermons and solve complicated social and political problems. The chief difficulty with Reacting as an

elective course is that it is sensitive to enrollment: that is, a Reacting class of eleven students will probably have to be cancelled (or combined with another low-enrollment Reacting course).

Reacting students and faculty endlessly debate whether the course should be required. The main problem concerns shy students, who are themselves sharply divided on the issue: some students find Reacting to be intimidating. Some say that they would not recommend the course to other shy students; on the other hand, some shy students say that while they would never have elected to take Reacting, they regard it as an experience that changed their lives by encouraging them to speak. These students insist that Reacting should be required.

Elements of a Reacting Game

An important text or texts: i.e., Plato's *Republic*, the *Analects of Confucius*, the Bible, Rousseau's *Social Contract*, etc. Sometimes these texts must be acquired separately—many of them are available as Penguin Classics. In other instances, the student booklet includes such materials;

A **student game book** (from 60-250 pages) that introduces the subject (always beginning with a fictional "you are there" account) and also outlines the basic rules of the game. The student packet also includes supporting materials from the historical context (actual laws, constitutions, additional shorter texts, etc.) and primary sources. Reacting game books are provided by Longman. A list of current Reacting games is included as an Appendix to this booklet;

An instructor's manual for each game (not for distribution to students). The manual outlines the pedagogical intentions, the historical context, the likely debates, and the factual basis for the post-mortem (after the game) discussion. This manual also includes illustrative student papers. Instructor's manuals are available from Longman.

A **set of roles** to be assigned to individual students. This is included as an appendix to each instructor's manual. After the initial two or three classes in which instructors introduce the other game materials, the instructor photocopies the roles and distributes them to students. Some of the roles are for small groups of students: these represent the major factions. Other roles are for individual students, who function as indeterminates or who otherwise introduce elements of historical verisimilitude and complexity. For example, the game, *The Threshold of Democracy: Athens in 403 B.C.*, includes four sets of major faction roles—radical democrats; moderate democrats; oligarchs; supporters of Socrates—as well as an additional seven roles for individual students, some of whom function as indeterminates (see section, "The Problem of the Indeterminates" in this manual).

Questions about Management

HOW LONG DOES A REACTING GAME LAST?

Each game outlines activities for a specific number of classes, and assumes a class length ranging from 60 to 80 minutes. The simplest games require a total of seven classes; the most complex require as many as eleven or twelve. Faculty can always add additional sessions, especially to the post-mortem discussion period. Students invariably want more sessions, and this can very easily be accommodated. For larger classes—those with nineteen students or more, additional sessions may be necessary to allow everyone to speak as often as he or she wishes.

In fact, faculty always complain that they need more time for the games; but they also find that, once students "get into a game" and have fully internalized their ideas, they don't want it to end until they have prevailed. By this point, however, diminishing returns set in quickly. It then becomes better to go on to another game, or to end the game and devote extra sessions for "out-of-game" discussion and analysis.

WHAT IS THE OPTIMAL LENGTH OF A REACTING CLASS?

The best length is an hour to 75 minutes. Longer classes can become exhausting. In such cases, recesses or formal breaks are essential. The games often provide for changes of location which make it easy to include recesses.

A Reacting game is not static: the issues shift rapidly. Students need time to digest the ideas and prepare papers on new topics. The basic design assumes that there is a day or two between classes for students to do more reading, meet with their factions, and prepare new papers. Three classes a week may be optimal, in that it allows time for teams to caucus outside of class and yet ensures enough time for the different components of the game to unfold. If a class meets every day of the week, students will not have enough time to digest the unfolding complexity; for five-day-a-week Reacting classes, the approach is to use every other day for faction meetings. On the other hand, a class that meets only once a week may cause the games to lose momentum and, spread over the course of two months, to become overwhelming.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS

Reacting games are designed for classes of from thirteen to twenty-one students. Games that are run with fewer than thirteen students result in a loss of some roles and considerable complexity. Larger classes can be readily accommodated, simply by adding one or more students to each of the factions, and increasing the number of indeterminates proportionately. Reacting faculty have reported success at running classes with as many as twenty-eight students.

For large classes (over twenty-one), student leaders may be hard-pressed to allow everyone to speak and to control the proceedings. In that event, instructors should disregard the "random distribution" of role advice (below) and ensure that strong student leaders are assigned the key leadership positions in the game.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

Flexibility is recommended. The assumption is that students will submit a total of eight to twelve pages of written work for each game. After the initial "set up" phase, the games move rapidly. A speech prepared early in the game may well be irrelevant by the end. It is best, therefore, for students to submit at least two pieces of writing, one fairly early on, and another after the midpoint.

In most instances, students themselves decide what to write and how to write it. The purpose of the writing and class participation is to further the objectives of the role to which they have been assigned. Students are mostly free to determine whether those objectives are best advanced through a formal essay, a sermon, draft legislation, a poem, or a short story. The point is that one writes and speaks not to impress an instructor with her vocabulary and literary pyrotechnics, but to accomplish some purpose with a reader. Writing is instrumental rather than ornamental; so is speaking. (See section, "Writing for Reacting," and also the Appendix B, "Teaching Writing for Reacting.")

Indeterminate students may have somewhat different assignments. Insofar as their role is, in part, to listen to the debates and eventually take a stand on them, they cannot be expected to take as active a role in the early classes. Sometimes Reacting faculty do not assign a class participation grade to indeterminates; sometimes indeterminates seek to acquaint the class with their "persona" by means of a fictional statement; sometimes indeterminates have restrictions on their indeterminacy. (See "The Problem of Indeterminates.")

With the exception of the indeterminates, though, class participation is usually intense; most classes are characterized by considerable jockeying for speaking time (see "Getting a Word In"). Faculty often find that they are obliged to give very high grades for class participation. Because class participation usually requires little additional inducement, some Reacting faculty weight writing more heavily than class participation in calculating the final grade. The game design usually assumes that 2/3rds of the grade will be for the written assignments, and 1/3 for class participation. This, of course, can be changed to suit the instructor's purposes.

ROLE OF INSTRUCTOR

It is no easy matter to run a traditional "Socratic" seminar: to get each student to take part in a coherent, roundtable discussion can be extremely demanding. A Reacting class, by contrast, may seem to require little of the instructor. During the first week or so the instructor "sets up" the game: this entails a fairly brief lecture to outline the historical context and another to introduce the main philosophical texts (or perhaps merely to provide a roadmap through them), with the remainder of the set-up phase allocated to distributing roles and answering questions. The instructor's manual for each game provides guidance for the content of the set-up lectures and other matters.

On or before the first session, the instructor should also distribute to the entire class, "For Students: An Introduction to 'Reacting to the Past,'" which is provided in Appendix C of this booklet. Illustrative "writing advisors" are included as part of that introduction as well. Faculty may prefer to substitute their own "writing advisories."

During the second week, after roles are assigned, the class may meet once or twice in factions. During this time, the instructor may shuttle from one group to another, answering questions about the text, providing suggestions about strategy, or offering encouragement. But after the setup, the instructor sits—often literally—off to the side. One of the main duties of the instructor during these classes is to relinquish class time and direction to the students; another is to provide reassurance to students who may be unnerved or unsure of what they are doing.

This would seem to be easy and in some ways it is.

But the Reacting pedagogy generates special challenges and problems of its own. Many Reacting students ask more questions about texts and history because they are drawn more deeply into the material. The nature of the assignments, moreover, demands more of students. It is far easier to write an essay on Arminianism in Puritan thought than to deliver a persuasive sermon advancing Arminian precepts. Students, too, will find the oddness of the situation confusing and unsettling. Many of them need considerable guidance and reassurance.

Thus while a Reacting instructor may sit through entire classes—indeed, entire weeks—without saying much of substance, he or she may be barraged with questions after class, or inundated with e-mails. Because the obstacles confronting students are great and the situations interesting, Reacting faculty themselves often get drawn deeply into the games and historical contexts. (For example: "Why, instructor, before meetings of the Athenian Assembly, did the priest sacrifice a pig and not a chicken or a goat?") The appropriate answer—"I'm not sure, let's look it up"—can prove stimulating for all concerned.

Reacting classes also generate a host of unusual problems and situations. Some of the problems are technical, and relate to issues pertaining to game design and management. Other matters are more unusual. Both types are considered later in this manual.

Motivational Inducements of the Reacting Pedagogy

Students are motivated in different ways; Reacting succeeds at engaging students by employing a variety of motivational devices. Faculty and students have identified the following psychological forces at work in Reacting:

ESCAPING FROM ONESELF

Undergraduates—especially first-year and second-year students—are often extremely self-conscious. Their adult identity remains unformed, and they often worry about how they will be regarded by peers and faculty. Rather than expose their fragile sense of self, many students assume a passive role in class (and sometimes outside of it as well). Reacting frees students from the constraints of self by assigning them roles—and thus identities—of a very different nature: they become oligarchs in ancient Athens, or Confucian literati in Ming China. Many students are liberated by this assumption of an alternative identity. A shy student who is reluctant to voice his own opinions often finds it easier —and sometimes exhilarating—to assume the identity of a Hindu extremist or a

Puritan divine, secure that he is not personally responsible for what he says and does. Protected by an ascribed role, he can develop arguments and take actions without fear of the harsh judgments of others.

COMPETITION

Reacting courses are structured as "games" for various reasons. One reason Reacting games are structured to have winners and losers is because conflict is embedded in the most significant historical moments. Some ideas prevail, and some do not; some groups (factions, social classes, nations) win, some lose. Additionally, our culture is competitive; students at selective colleges have themselves internalized at least some of this competitive ethos. A Reacting game therefore resonates with the psyche of the students: many students want to win and despair of losing. The competitive elements of the game are often a powerful motivator.

TEAMWORK

In every game, most (but not all) students are assigned to a team: the democratic faction in ancient Greece; the cabal of Confucian critics of the Wanli emperor in Ming China; the conservative clergy of the Inquisition during the Trial of Galileo. The competitive elements of a game further encourage teamwork: members of an effective team more successfully apportion the workload, coordinate arguments and strategy, and provide emotional and intellectual support during debates. Teamwork not only helps motivate students to do well, but it is also instructional: much of the teaching of Reacting occurs outside of class, when teams meet to discuss strategy and develop arguments. A good team will encourage weaker students to work harder and take an active part in class sessions. (Faculty report that some teams arrange to awaken late-sleepers to ensure their attendance in Reacting classes.) In class, the members of a team will generally sit together, pass notes, and caucus incessantly. Many students work hard to win the esteem of team members and do their best to avoid letting it down. Some students care more about earning this esteem than getting good grades or winning the game.

STUDENT EMPOWERMENT

After a game has been set up, the instructor—or Gamemaster—turns the game over to student-leaders, chosen in accordance with the historical context: each session of the Athenian assembly is run by a president chosen randomly from among all citizens; the proceedings of the Hanlin Academy, which supervises the 30,000 bureaucrats of Ming China, are directed by a First Grand Secretary—a student chosen by the emperor (herself selected randomly, to reflect the accident of birth); the General Court of Massachusetts Bay Colony is presided over by Governor Winthrop, elected by members of the colony who possess political rights.

These student-leaders set the agenda and decide who speaks and when, subject to the rules prescribed by the game. Some students, especially at the outset, are confused or unnerved by the fact that students are running the class, and that faculty are not. But many students assume a proprietary relation to the games. They like being "in charge" and want to prove that they can do so competently—or even brilliantly. In addition to those students who have leadership roles, all students can develop their own strategies

and arguments, either individually or as members of a team. Many Reacting students come to believe that **they** are in charge, and that the class is their own. The opportunity to run a class, and indeed an empire, is part of the appeal of Reacting. Sometimes students flub their chance, and this too is instructive.

By watching each other lead, students learn the difference between bossiness and leadership.

THE D. W. GRIFFITH PHENOMENON: VICARIOUS ENGAGEMENT WITH THE PAST

Ever since "The Birth of a Nation," movie producers have understood that people like to experience history vicariously. Reacting exploits the same psychological impulse. It is one thing to watch a movie of, say, "The Last Emperor"; it is another to take on the role of an actual Chinese emperor. In the former, the audience imaginatively inhabits historical space that has been evoked by vivid costumes and sets. Rather than provide the visual markers of a Hollywood set, Reacting encourages students to internalize the ideas and identities of people in the past. The more a Reacting game **credibly resembles** the past, the more students identify with the historical context of the game. Faculty report that students occasionally come to class "in costume"; others note that sometimes students insist on being addressed, during the class, by their "game" name. "Excuse me. Do not call me Catherine. My name is Danton."

TAKING PART IN A DRAMA

Great texts often emerge from great human dramas: Plato's *Republic* was a product of the civil war following Athens's defeat in the Peloponnesian war; and Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* was animated by the passions of that extraordinary historical moment. The games recreate important human dramas where the stakes are historically important. A Reacting class becomes exciting, partly because the students are not sure exactly how the tension is going to be resolved.

In a sense, this "conflict resolution" is more like sports than theater, because no one knows at the outset who is going to win or how the conflict will turn out. This makes it more exciting.

Students want to win because they like winning, but often they also want to win because they want to influence history: to ensure that Anne Hutchinson is acquitted (or receives the punishment she deserves); to preserve India from partition (or to protect the interests of the Sikhs or the Untouchables or the Hindu purists). Often students genuinely care about the outcomes of the game because the conflict is bound up with issues that echo through the centuries and resonate with the present.

The drama of a Reacting class builds as the game progresses; virtually no student misses the final sessions. They come, in part, because the drama is so compelling.

LIMINAL INVERSIONS

The drama and tension of the games, the oddness of the historical settings, the inversion of status (students run empires, and the class!), and the emotional intensity—all of these combine to create a psychological dynamic known as liminality: a transitional state characterized by the effacement of one identity and its replacement with something else. Scholars apply the term to initiatory rites, religious festivals of transformation, Lords of Misrule, carnivals, and many other social activities in which customary social rules and identities are confused and subverted.

Successful Reacting games resemble liminal rites: a student's normal self is set aside and a new, and imaginatively a more powerful, one, replaces it. During class, moreover, unusual and unexpected things happen. For this reason Reacting classes often take on an unusual emotional tenor: laughter, confusion, tension, discomfort, unpredictability, and weirdness. All of these are evidence of liminality. Sometimes this liminality is unsettling, but nearly always it is **interesting**. Once a game begins to acquire liminality, usually in the final week, students unconsciously employ the present tense or refer to themselves with their "new" gender pronouns—"You should respect the Emperor because Marianne has shown that he adheres to Confucian precepts." Not all classes or games attain this magical liminal state, but when they do, the Reacting experience will be truly unforgettable. Students often find this charged state appealing, and will push the games to attain it.

GRADES

Reacting, though experimental, retains this tried-and-true psychological inducement. It still works, and is essential to the pedagogy. Within Reacting, grades perform a significant task in holding students to their historical role. Their "role" packet instructs students to use their written work and class presentations to advance their specified objectives. Papers and presentations that fail to do this are ineffective and graded accordingly; effective presentations, conversely, help ensure that the requisite historical views are voiced. Those who "win" the games receive a bonus for the "class participation" component of their grade. The effect on a student's final grade is very marginal, but in the absence of grades, students are tempted to give their own, personal thoughts (often intuitive and unconsidered) on the matter.

For example, students who are assigned to support the orthodox ministers in Puritan Boston—which obliges them to see expulsion of Anne Hutchinson for heretical beliefs—are sometimes tempted to reject the role. "But Hutchinson just says what she believes. That's no reason to kick her out and into the wilderness." At this point, the instructor can—and should—say: "Many, many people who opposed Hutchinson believed passionately in their cause. Do you know why? And if you don't know why, how can you assume that 'there is no reason' to suppress her beliefs. THEY had a reason, and you're obliged not only to learn it, but to argue it persuasively in your papers and in class. And if you don't, your team will likely lose. And that means—too—that you will not receive the winner's bonus.

By obliging students to take a particular historical position, and by rewarding those who succeed in advocating their position with a grade bonus, however inconsequential, most

students adhere to the roles and debate them more passionately. Occasionally a student will repudiate the role fate has dealt her. As in life, there are costs to such behavior.

CONCLUSION: PSYCHOLOGICAL INDUCEMENTS

Students are not equally affected by these psychological factors. Some students "want to win"; some are sensitive to peer pressure and teamwork; some wish to steer the class toward liminal edginess; some like controlling the class (and other students); and some want good grades. A well-designed and well-led game employs many or all of these psychological inducements, thus ensuring that most students will engage with the materials and the experience.

Just as faculty can emphasize some pedagogical objectives, they may also stress certain psychological inducements. An instructor can reduce competition by eliminating the grade bonus for "winning." Or an instructor can alter the degree of student empowerment merely be changing his or her seating position: to promote a greater sense of student empowerment, the instructor can sit quietly in a remote corner of the room; on the other hand, if a class becomes too independent or high-handed, the instructor may sit next to the student leaders to help them exercise control. Reacting faculty influence the Reacting experience chiefly through the manipulation of psychological inducements.

Technical Matters in Game Management

DISTRIBUTION OF ROLES

This task must be undertaken with some thought and care. The most important consideration is to ensure that the social deck is shuffled. Students who were Radical Democrats in ancient Athens should not all be assigned as supporters of Anne Hutchinson in Massachusetts Bay Colony. The need to shuffle would be true of other social affiliations. People from the same dorm, sorority, section of the country, or other form of social identification are best assigned to different factions. This makes the game more interesting, builds a sense of community, and stimulates creative exchanges.

Students accept the need for shuffling; on the other hand, they prefer that roles are distributed randomly. Many crave the opportunity to function in a leadership role, or take on a demanding challenge, and they resent it if the instructor assigns such roles on the basis of preconceptions as to students' performance.

Nevertheless, some roles are unusually difficult and demanding; some faculty want certain roles to go to students who are more likely to master them. There is no hard and fast rule. Faculty should be aware of both sides of the issue. Other things to keep in mind:

> No student should be given more than one major leadership role in any semester. Leaders invariably become the most committed to any game, and profit from it to the greatest extent; moreover, they often devote inordinate effort and time to the

game, perhaps to the detriment of other classes. For their sake and to allow other students to benefit from the experience of leading, instructors should exclude previous leaders from positions of leadership in new games.

Students should be assigned to no more than one indeterminate role per semester. It often makes sense for student leaders in one game to be indeterminates in the next, partly so that they can catch up on their work in other classes. Most indeterminate roles require less investment of time, energy, and emotion. Certain indeterminate roles, however, are especially challenging and demanding. This is evident from a quick perusal.

GIVING LECTURES ON UNFAMILIAR TOPICS

For the set-up classes prior to the beginning of the game, Reacting instructors normally provide guided discussion/lectures on the historical context and on the major texts. The instructor manuals provide some guidance on what can be discussed, and on the sorts of questions that can be posed.

For those instructors who are not especially familiar with the game's historical context or texts, a measure of candor can be productive: "I am not a scholar on ancient Athens, and so I'm not sure of the answer to your question. Let's look it up. Post an email on the website indicating what you've found." Students will find it easier to speak in such an environment, too. The readings section of the instructor's manual provides sources that students can consult. These books should be put on reserve for such purposes.

THE PROBLEM OF THE INDETERMINATES

Intellectual debate between two or more parties is at the heart of every game: students pick apart texts to find materials to support their positions, and they argue. But the arguments would be empty—a mere display of debating skills—if no one were free to be **persuaded** by what is said and written. For this reason, some students in most games are assigned roles that are not fixed but "indeterminate." "Indeterminate" roles do not have set victory objectives at the outset of the game. An "indeterminate" student is expected to listen to the debates and decide which position makes more sense. The contending factions thus struggle to win over the indeterminates.

In the early versions of Reacting, the indeterminates functioned explicitly as a jury or panel. But this did not work. The jurors did not have much reason to explore the texts or historical materials; they were, for this reason, poor jurors and they tended to apply contemporary standards to the debates. Moreover, they found their role passive and boring. While members of the partisan factions became energized and passionate about the game, the jury members couldn't wait for it to end.

This posed a real problem in game design: indeterminates found the experience unfulfilling; and yet without dispassionate jurors, the debates were meaningless. One of the main challenges in designing Reacting games is to retain the indeterminate role, without which there can be no real debates, and yet structure those roles so that they are embedded in the historical context in a meaningful and interesting way.

Design Solutions

The games have been designed, and modified with repeated playings, so as to "solve" the problem of the indeterminates. The nature of the solutions varies with the historical context itself, but generally fit one of the following categories:

1) Indeterminacy is cloaked in historical garb:

The indeterminate role is sometimes qualified: an indeterminate's freedom to take one side or another is qualified by particular historical circumstances. In the Athens game, for example, one indeterminate student might be assigned the role of a poor citizen-farmer. The "role" (representative of a significant social milieu in ancient Athens) may further provide: that the farmer has several daughters, who must have dowries to marry; that he has taken out loans from Athenian merchant-bankers to add to his fields; that the current crop is in peril, due to drought or blight; and that he is worried about falling into debt, losing his farm and being sold into slavery. The student assigned this role is indeterminate in the sense that he is free to vote and argue as a member of the Athenian Assembly (all citizens) as he wishes: he is free to be **persuaded**; on the other hand, he is obliged to prove to the instructor that "his" opinions are consistent with "his" historical context. The game packet describes it this way:

An indeterminate role is something of a contradiction in terms. The "victory objectives" of the Indeterminates are incomplete, imprecise, or undisclosed. Each student will be given the persona of a particular type of person who lived in Athens in the late 5th century B.C. Each Indeterminate is responsible to the Gamemaster for making her actions—her written and oral work and, of course, her positions on various issues—plausible within the parameters of her assigned persona. Yet the role is "undetermined" in the sense that each indeterminate is expected to express some measure of her own character. This is an insoluble issue, insofar as none of us can fully determine to what extent our beliefs represent our independent, core self and to what extent they are a consequence of what we have learned from our society and culture.

While the partisan students in the factions are working through their arguments, the indeterminates are researching the historical context of their role, and sharing their particular concerns with the entire group. (Poor Citizen-Farmer to the Athenian Assembly: "The Radical Democrats are proposing that Athens send a military expedition to exact tribute from Naxos, money that would be to subsidize attendance at the Assembly. This makes sense and seems fair to me—I certainly could use the money; but what is the likelihood that I would have to go to war myself? And what—gulp—is the likelihood I would die in the fighting?") This type of information helps focus the debates among partisans so that they accord with historical conditions; and it ensures that the debaters have the **possibility** of winning adherents from among indeterminates. Once the views of indeterminates begin to coalesce, the instructor may wish to translate them into "victory goals" and then encourage indeterminates to assume partisan roles. (Gamemaster to citizen-farmer, in private communication: "Based on what you have said about your position, and it seems credible to me for someone in your circumstances, you 'win' if, at the end of the game, the Athenian Assembly has

voted, in addition to X and Y, to go on a military expedition to raise tribute—assuming the expedition is successful—and if that tribute is used to embark on more such expeditions.")

2) Indeterminates become active participants in the games:

In the preceding example, the indeterminate's role during the game is mostly informational, at least until the final session or two. It remains fairly passive. But some games have managed to structure the indeterminates to take active roles from the outset. In the *Trial of Anne Hutchinson*, for example, the indeterminates are all recently-arrived immigrants to Massachusetts Bay Colony, each of whom has a different background (qualified indeterminacy). And each of the immigrants, as part of their victory objective, must gain admittance to the Boston (Congregational) Church. (Only church members possessed political rights, and thus could serve on the General Court, which decided the fate of Anne Hutchinson.) The petitions of the immigrants, and their interrogations by the members of the church, place these "indeterminates" at the heart of the action at the outset, and yet leave them mostly free to weigh the merits of the intellectual issues in dispute **after** they have become members of the General Court.

3) Indeterminate roles are replaced by multiple factions

When a game has three or more factions, there is little need for indeterminates; complexity itself stands as a surrogate for indeterminacy. The game set in India on the eve of independence in 1945 is an example. It has few indeterminate roles because the entire context is itself **indeterminate**; the task of the game is to achieve consensus among Hindu extremists, Hindu secularists, Islamic extremists, Muslim secularists, Sikhs, Untouchables, independent princes, British commissioners, Communists, etc. It is probably true that there are more than two sides to every historical issue, so multiple factions can often be introduced into most Reacting games. But as games become more complex, it becomes more difficult to focus the debate.

On-going Faculty Guidance and Direction

The games are designed to minimize the problem of the indeterminates, but Reacting instructors must still pay special attention to them, or else they may disappear amidst the smoke of the battle between contending factions.

Faculty should remain in contact with the indeterminates throughout the game. During the second week, when the main factions are meeting separately, the instructor may wish to meet with each indeterminate alone. The faculty member can push the indeterminate into researching his or her role. To the marginal Athenian farmer-citizen: "What is it like to be a small farmer in Athens in 403 B.C.? What crops do you grow? How are they sold and to whom? How did you acquire the money to buy the farm? What are the chances that you will lose it and be sold into slavery? How did you find a wife (or husband)? Who will your daughters marry? How can they acquire husbands? What are your religious beliefs, etc., etc.?" After the Athenian farmer-citizen has acquired some sense of "who she is," she should be encouraged to explain "herself" to the rest of the class (in writing, and in some public forum), all the better to help them shape their arguments to persuade her of **their** views. (This, too, helps ensure that the

substance of the debates is rooted in the detailed context of the past.) The instructor can further increase the indeterminate's role, in the above instance, for example, by advising the marginal farmer that, in week four of the game, the crop should be ready for harvesting, but that the harvest is determined in part by the vagaries of nature. To reflect those vagaries, a die will be rolled at the beginning of class: a 1 through 2 will signify a bumper crop, and prosperity, a die roll of 6 will mean that there has been a blight, or storm, etc, and the crop has failed, perhaps thrusting the farmer into bankruptcy (and even slavery—an obvious loss). This sort of inventiveness, when historically credible, helps draw the indeterminate further into the workings of the game, and also obliges the other parties to address the particularities of the actual historical context.

Creativity, perhaps pitched to the special interests of the student, is often very useful. ("OK, Michelle. I see that you are on the varsity tennis team. In devising your Athenian persona, let's assume that you once were an athlete who represented Athens in the decathlon, finishing second to someone from Thebes. Athens voted you a prize of X drachmas, which you used to buy a farm. You want your son to train. . .")

THE PROBLEM OF "LOCK-UP"

Sometimes indeterminates will prematurely surrender their indeterminacy so as to placate a friend in the class, or to assume the more definite (and thus comfortable) position of a partisan advocate: this, too, requires Gamemaster supervision. Once most of the indeterminates have taken sides, the debates become empty and the game "locks up": little purpose is served in continuing it.

This sort of "lock up" poses no problem if it occurs in the last or even the next to last class: but faculty should watch out for it at earlier stages. In one playing of the game on Athenian democracy, a brilliant and indomitable indeterminate immediately persuaded all of the other indeterminates to join her in opposition to the democrats. From the outset the democrats were consistently outvoted in the Assembly and, worse, they perceived that none of the indeterminates were taking their views seriously. The debates became hollow and rancorous.

When an instructor perceives that the indeterminates are making their minds up prematurely, he or she may choose to take strong action. All games include language indicating that the instructor—as Gamemaster—can change the rules or add new ones as he or she wishes, and without publicly informing anyone at all. The Gamemaster may wish to change or switch student roles: perhaps the instructor might inform the prematurely "anti-democratic" student that she had undergone a metamorphosis and has now become a member of the democratic faction; or perhaps tell her that she has had a religious experience and is now a religious hierophant, incapable of taking a stand on political matters, etc. Her game role will be to study augury and divination, and issue portents before each session of the Assembly.

All Reacting games have been tested, and various rules and roles have been created to make the game work. But sharp, energized students are capable of frustrating or circumventing even the best game design. Faculty must be prepared to change the rules or devise new ones on the spot, as seems necessary.

Keep in mind, too, that sometimes the real history "locked up," and this may help guide the Gamemaster. Once during the *Trial of Anne Hutchinson*, a class locked-up during the fourth week: the defenders of Anne perceived that most of the indeterminates were against her and incapable of being persuaded otherwise; but Anne's defenders could not abide Governor Winthrop or his brand of Puritanism any longer. Rather than remain in his "corrupt" Boston, they wanted to abandon it. This posed a real problem for the instructor because two more sessions remained in the game. But the instructor—a true Gamemaster—was unflappable, and recalled that such schisms were common in 17th-century Massachusetts. Rather than arbitrarily "unlock" the game or declare it prematurely over, the instructor agreed to allow Anne's defenders to leave Boston and found a new Puritan community in Connecticut. Thus the final session of the game was held in two separate locations: Boston (the regular seminar room), and "someplace in Connecticut," (i.e., a campus café) where Anne's faction followed historical precedent in establishing a new community, constituted according to her religious principles.

POSSIBILITIES FOR CUSTOMIZING GAMES

While considerable effort has been put into the design and improvement of existing games, Reacting faculty are encouraged to customize them to suit their own pedagogical goals, philosophy, and historical judgment. There are several reasons why faculty might wish to customize the games:

Historical judgments differ

The game design reflects the views of the designers, the specialist consultants, the faculty who have supervised games, and the students who have played them. The game designs, in short, are strong historical statements; these statements, like all historical assertions, may be wrong or incomplete. The Anne Hutchinson game, for example, includes a few "indeterminate" roles that are not in fact indeterminate: unbeknownst to the other students, two of the student "immigrants" have come to Massachusetts Bay Colony not to worship God in the proper Puritan way (the issue that divides most of the players in the game), but solely to make money. They want to undermine the authority of Governor Winthrop and the General Court so as to pass legislation eliminating controls on wages and prices. The game design thus asserts that the theological dispute was subtly inflected by economic issues. Some historians contend that economic factors played little significant role in the trial, and instructors who concur may seek to eliminate these roles from the game; on the other hand, some materialists might contend that economic factors were absolutely critical to the outcome, and therefore seek to include it as a game objective for seven players, say, as opposed to two.

Reacting faculty are of course free to make their own judgments on such matters, and change the game accordingly. Even students are encouraged to propose rule changes, informed by their own researches on the period. ("Your point, Sarah, about the role of women in Ming succession is a good one. Let me see your research. If it stands up, I'll change the rules so that. . .") The reason for these changes should be explained after the game is over so as to enhance everyone's historical understanding (see "Post-Mortem").

Need for variation among Reacting classes

Another reason for customizing games is to ensure the distinctiveness of each class. This is especially important if more than one Reacting class is operating at the same time on the same campus: information will inevitably seep from one class to another. Insofar as some of the rules are necessarily secret, this can pose problems. Some games—the *Threshold of Democracy: Athens in 403 B.C.* is the best example—have considerable randomness embedded throughout, and thus are somewhat insulated from seepage.

Faculty involvement

Faculty who have modified a game are more conscious of how the various elements interact. Such faculty, moreover, have likely developed a sense about the text and historical period, and they often enjoy seeing what happens when students reenact this vision—the faculty member's vision. If the modification falls somehow short, or leads students in a direction that doesn't make much sense, that too can be sorted out: instructors can always set the record straight in the post-mortem discussion after the game is over. ("Sorry, class, I made the Anne Hutchinson faction too numerous, which was probably why she was acquitted here—and not in history. The actual vote of the General Court was 17-4 against her, but that would have made a lopsided game, etc. Why do you suppose the Hutchinson faction in real history was so badly outnumbered on the General Court?")

PLAYING AN HISTORICAL PERSON

An important design consideration is whether to have students play actual historical figures. Sometimes this enhances students' identification with their parts, and has a powerful pedagogical purpose: other students acquire an understanding of that figure's views and historical significance by associating it with the student. In the India game, for example, when students are given the option of being an anonymous secular leader of the Muslim League or of being Ali Jinnah (the secular Muslim who actually lead the ML and founded Pakistan); or if given the choice of being a generic leader of the Untouchables or of being Dr. Ambedkar, the actual Untouchable leader; of being an independent prince or of being the Nizam of Hyderabad, a famous playboy and the richest man in the world—in nearly every instance students prefer to assume the identity of the actual historical person. Because their "game objectives" are based on those of that person, the students could study that person's actions and writings to gain insight into how to play their roles. They learned from their namesake's successes and mistakes. The others began to see these students not as a peer—"Laurie"—but as the Nizam. This taught nearly everyone much more about the historical circumstances, and in a concrete and memorable way.

But however much Laurie learned about the Nizam, she was not a rich playboy. The reality of the game did not replicate the past, and this doubtless confused students as to what the real Nizam did and said. Moreover, by playing the Nizam, Laurie was responsible for everything that the Nizam had done. Her critics could undermine "her" arguments by citing what "he" had done in 1936. Laurie could have fun in dismissing

charges that "he" was a relentless womanizer, but other aspects of her "historical" position could be more awkward: the Nizam ran a police state.

A more central example concerns the Wanli emperor: the whole game is about influencing the actions—the decision as to a successor—of the Wanli. The student playing this role must defend that decision, and will also be obliged to defend and even explain the Wanli's earlier actions and writings. The same is true of the student playing John Winthrop.

In all of these instances, the historical mindsets of the personage being represented are not difficult or obscure. The Wanli's actions, and indeed his thinking, are susceptible to elementary empathizing, and the same is true of Winthrop, a pragmatic and plain-spoken leader. The *Confucianism and the Succession Crisis of the Wanli Emperor* game does not turn on the Wanli's thoughts, but on the interpretation of the *Analects of Confucius*: did the Wanli's actions correspond with what was proper? So, too, in the *Trial of Anne Hutchinson* with Winthrop, who initiated action against Hutchinson but added precious little to the intellectual substance of the argument against her. For games set in the modern era, the use of historical personages is perhaps unavoidable: Lafayette was central to the constitutional monarchy-phase of the French revolution (1791); and Gandhi, Nehru, Ali Jinnah, and Maulana Azad were the key figures in India in 1945. Students assigned these roles enjoy reading about "their" figures, each of whom left accessible memoirs. When students speak **as** these figures to the class, moreover, they convey in a vivid way what these historical figures were about.

But there is no "Socrates" figure in the ancient Athens game, which includes a scenario for a "trial of Socrates"; and there is no "Anne Hutchinson" in the *Trial of Anne Hutchinson* game. In both instances, the reason is the same. Few students (or faculty, for that matter), can credibly represent the "Socrates" that has come to us through Plato and Xenophon. Interrogation of any student-Socrates would likely shift the focus of the game from Plato's *Republic* to the student's pale attempts to explicate those fine words. Anne Hutchinson, too, was a religious visionary whose keen logic enabled her to torment her accusers. Rather than have a another student ask "student-Hutchinson" to explain what "Anne Hutchinson" meant when she perceived God "by immediate revelation," the game allows her accusers and defenders to act as historians, reexamining and reinterpreting her words in light of Puritan thought at the time.

Instructors may choose to add actual historical figures to any game. The examples of the Wanli emperor, Winthrop, Gandhi, and Ali Jinnah show that this is necessary and often recommended. Students, certainly, are grateful to have an historical figure to help guide them. But some caution should be used in giving students roles of figures whose words are at the heart of the debates.

GENDER AND THE DEARTH OF FEMALE WOMEN FIGURES

Female students have little difficulty playing male roles. Indeed, one of the positive aspects of Reacting is the readiness with which women assume such roles, and how readily males seem to accept them. When a woman is selected as Wanli emperor, some may initially titter about discussion of "his" concubine. But over the course of the game, male and female students alike increasingly and unconsciously identify her with the male

pronoun. Students will readily say things such as: "Liz is wrong. When he contends that Confucius believes. . ."

Female students complain that there are few female roles. This is a flaw whose roots are planted in the patriarchal soil of most traditional societies. Women were by no means irrelevant to the historical episodes represented in the original Reacting games. Women performed crucial roles in the succession crisis of the Wanli emperor: the real Wanli's first wife and his mother, as well as the Wanli's favored concubine, were the major figures in building powerful contending factions during the crisis, and they even helped keep the dispute going for decades. But bureaucratic power formally reposed solely in the hands of men—the emperor, and the top scholars of the Hanlin academy, from which women were excluded. No women could have taken part in the formal debate on which the game is based.

A similar problem is found in the *Trial of Anne Hutchinson*. Anne, of course, is the most important figure in this historical episode, and yet she does not appear as a "student player" partly because of her centrality (see previous section). Nevertheless women figured prominently throughout this historical episode. Anne's original Bible meetings were with groups of women, whose numbers swelled and eventually included many men. Women became full members of the Boston Church who voted on an equal basis with men. Yet the decision on whether to banish Hutchinson, and indeed all political rights in the colony, rested with the General Court, composed solely of men.

Additional games, most of them fairly modern, are being designed to incorporate female historical figures. Whether male students readily and credibly assume the roles, say, of Rosa Luxemburg ("German socialism and the decision for war, 1914") or Eleanor Roosevelt ("The Debate over the Equal Rights Amendment during the 1930s") remains to be seen.

CLASS PARTICIPATION

Some students will find the classroom experience intimidating. A background in debating is only somewhat useful: debating is about impressing judges and scoring points; Reacting is about persuading peers. The student's task is not to impress but to persuade other students of ideas that may sound strange to contemporary ears: the need for censorship of the arts in ancient Athens; a wife's duty to obey her husband in Ming China; the justice of the Puritan God's decision to consign everyone, including infants, to eternal damnation.

Many students are reluctant to speak—in Reacting or any other class. Many are terrified of voicing strange opinions, especially when they expect others in the class to pounce on their statements. Often Reacting faculty allow students to read their initial presentations aloud. This takes time, but it acclimates them, and the class, to speaking, and to hearing the sound of their voice. Usually the other side will seek to rebut the speaker's positions, and these can begin in the form of questions and answers, which draw the speaker out of the paper and into freer discussion.

By the fourth week, most students will feel fairly secure about **what** they should be saying, though they may not believe much of it. But by the fifth and final week, many

students will feel confident enough of "their" views, and perhaps even be persuaded of them, to argue them effectively, even passionately.

As a result of the multiple psychological devices to spur student engagement, Reacting classes by the fourth or fifth week often become overcrowded with speakers: in the time remaining, many students find it difficult to ask their questions, make their rebuttals, and deliver their arguments. The problem is complicated by the fact that the classes are run by other students, and usually students who have a highly partisan role.

In the early Reacting games, this became a source of great dispute. Students of the minority team, or the one that did not possess formal power, found it difficult to voice their opinions. Equally serious, the quieter students on any faction found it hard if not impossible to thrust themselves into an energetic dispute. These students wanted to be heard; the instructor, keen to draw them out, wanted to hear them; and yet the student leaders did not call on them, or they simply could not carve out the space in the clutter of the debates.

An effective way to resolve this problem is to provide a table lectern, or even a podium, and include a rule that students are always free to stand at the podium, and even form a line there, so as to better command the attention of the student leader and the rest of the class. The instructor can privately warn the student leader—the president of the day for the Athenian Assembly, the First Grand Secretary of the Hanlin Academy in the Forbidden City in Beijing, Governor Winthrop, etc.—that he or she must "respect the podium" by giving the people who are standing there a decent chance to be heard. In some Reacting classes, more students are sometimes lined up at the podium than are seated around the table. This device usually succeeds at ensuring that everyone has a chance to express themselves.

BEST SPACES TO HOLD REACTING CLASSES

Reacting faculty should pay some attention to where their class is held. The second week of most games is devoted to factional meetings, which must meet separately; also during the public full session during weeks three through five, there will likely be recesses when various factions will caucus privately, and sometimes in new configurations. That is to say, all of the action during class time will not take place in the same room.

It is important that alternative spaces be readily available, perhaps within a minute's walk of the main classroom. A remote section of the library, a dorm lounge, or simply a corner of the stairway will often suffice. But some space should be available for these purposes.

A second consideration is that a Reacting class may become noisy. Sometimes many students speak at the same time; and student leaders, to command attention in acrimonious situations, are not averse to shouting. This can prove disruptive to faculty leading quieter seminars, or straining to be heard in large lectures. Reacting faculty generally prefer to have their classes located in a fairly remote section of campus, or adjacent to a lounge or café; failing in that, they prefer that Reacting courses are grouped together, because they are less likely to be distracted.

TEACHING SPEAKING FOR REACTING

One challenge in college education is to get students to speak. To control costs, many colleges increasingly rely on large lectures; and even in seminars, especially required general education courses, faculty often complain that students do not speak much.

All faculty who have taught Reacting are struck by its effectiveness in getting students to speak. Reacting students concur and, with the exception of a rare "crash," when the game lurches into a dead-end, students do **all** of the speaking once a game has begun. Reacting students are therefore befuddled by course questionnaires that ask how students could be persuaded to participate more. "Participate more?" one student wrote. "What we needed were tranquilizers."

Reacting succeeds well in making students want to contribute in class. But often they do not really know how to speak effectively or persuasively. They are accustomed to their auditors agreeing with them, and their speech is commonly littered with consensual affirmations, such as the ubiquitous, "you know?"

Many students have rarely spoken to an audience whose members disagree with them vociferously. They don't know **how** to speak in such a context, and faculty are often uncertain of how to guide them. Rhetoric, regarded as indispensable several centuries (and millennia) ago, has long since disappeared from the curriculum.

Reacting students learn from their own experiences and from each other. They often imitate each other's successful innovations—the use of gestures and visual props; the power of analogies; and the appeal of stories.

Some instructors try to wean shy students from reading aloud by having them use notecards, and progressively fewer notecards, until they approach the podium with a single notecard. By the third game of the semester, some faculty flatly announce either that students cannot read their papers aloud or that no oral presentation based on a "read aloud" text will receive a grade higher than a B.

Over the course of a semester the oral skills of most students improve substantially. (This has been confirmed by experiments in which Reacting students and a control group were, at the outset of the semester and again immediate afterwards, singly brought into a psych lab, given background materials on a contemporary issue, asked to frame an argument, and then make it into a tape recorder. These speeches were then blindly "graded" by judges. While the control group showed no improvement, the speeches of the Reacting students improved significantly.) Whether students learn particular skills or simply become more accustomed to this type of speaking has yet to be determined. Faculty have noted, as have veteran students themselves, that the students' manner of speaking changes during the course of the year. Initially, student presentations are more formal, with a higher diction. But over the course of the year, they tend to shift to a more personal, psychologically sophisticated rhetoric: more humor, less sarcasm; more empathy, less distancing. Yet sometimes a formal presentation, carefully structured and delivered, remains powerful.

Most Reacting instructors leave it to the students what style of speaking that works best for them. This seems to suffice, but shy students doubtless would appreciate more direction.

TEACHING WRITING FOR REACTING

A central premise of Reacting is that written expression (as well as oral expression) should be functional. Students write (and speak) to inform an audience or persuade it to do something. A corollary is that after a writer has determined her objective, she should structure her prose to achieve it. Reacting faculty are encouraged to set some criteria—total number of pages to be submitted for the game (8-12 is recommended), with at least ½ of them being submitted half way through the game, etc.

Reacting writing is challenging because it often pertains to issues raised in difficult texts, and because students are obliged to persuade others of ideas that may be remote (the Calvinist notion of God, the Dominican conception of human inequality) or difficult (the merits of censorship, the beauty of the Hindu caste system).

Some students who are adept at speaking argue that the games are all about persuasion, which they have shown is best accomplished orally. Some view the writing as mere window dressing. Yet most find that the process of finding words for their ideas and fixing them on paper helps **clarify** and **organize** and **develop** those ideas. Good writing promotes good speaking.

Moreover, while Reacting classes are small enough for oral persuasion to prevail, it is less effective for communicating complicated or challenging ideas with large audiences. Students should learn how to write instrumental prose (i.e., words that are meant to persuade for some specific ends).

Often some shy students excel at written exposition; and often the students who are the most effective leaders are not especially good writers. By displaying both modes of communication so prominently, students can learn from each other.

To that end, and also to advance the ideas of the games, students are obliged to make nearly all of their written work available for consideration by their peers. This sharpens the debates, because it gives each side access to the other's verbatim arguments. It also underscores the point that writing is meant to engage and persuade an audience; students are more likely to attend to issues of organization and clarity when they know their peers will also be reading their work.

Instrumental writing is something of a special genre. To help Reacting faculty and students with its demands, four "Writing Advisories" for students have been included as an appendix with this Manual. It is illustrative rather than exhaustive.

In most Reacting games, student papers are posted on a class-specific on-line bulletin board. There are many advantages of this approach: students can make their papers available to the entire class almost instantly, thus making it easier for other students to benefit immediately from their ideas and arguments. A web discussion site is useful, too, in that it allows the faculty member to inform the class of rule changes or clarifications. The problem with an on-line posting of papers is that some students do not bother to read them.

In the game *Rousseau, Burke, and Revolution in France, 1791*, factions are organized around newspapers, with the editor of the newspaper serving as the faction leader. In the past, factions have published elaborate weekly newspapers (including news reports, editorials, cartoons, and "advice for the lovelorn" columns). The newspapers were photocopied and distributed before class. This posed a tremendous challenge to each team, but one that **every** faction nearly always met on time (assuming twenty minutes late is, by student standards, "on time"). Based on post-game surveys, students read a far higher proportion of these printed papers than papers posted on the class online bulletin board. Whether this will change as students become still more computer-attuned is unclear.

GUIDING STUDENTS THROUGH PROMPT GRADING OF THEIR PAPERS

Students need considerable feedback on their writing, and they need it promptly. Because Reacting papers come in rapid succession, sometimes in a great chaotic gush, the instructor is hard-pressed to provide a rapid response.

On the other hand, Reacting faculty—having mutely observed debates—often are eager to join in. Responding to student papers, promptly and substantively, is the best way for the faculty member to become part of the game: "Your argument that India's new constitution should legalize the caste system fails to address the problem of the Untouchables, who are outside of the caste system." Or: "Your argument in this paper, and in class, was based on a weak analogy: you might have more persuasively compared . . ." Or: "You have chosen to attack Socrates by lampooning him in a poem: but is a poem the best means of persuading readers of his impiety?"

In short, the time that faculty might usually put into preparing lectures or notes for discussion can best be focused on providing prompt guidance to students on their class performances and writing. Some faculty respond via e-mail so that criticisms on the 3rd week paper can be of use in preparing the 5th week paper.

SMALL GRADE BONUS FOR "WINNING": PROS AND CONS

A way to strengthen the team concept, especially in the early games, and to energize the games further, is for the Gamemaster to announce that those who attain their victory objectives—i.e., who "win"—will receive a small grade bonus for the class participation component of their grade. (Barnard faculty who have included this "bonus" have defined it as a half-grade bonus: insofar as most Barnard Reacting classes assign 2/3 of the grade for each game for written work, the "winner bonus" comprises 3% of the total grade for the game: And because most students' class participation grades are very high, it is even more irrelevant.)

Though the "winner's bonus" is inconsequential in practical terms, it has enormous psychological implications. Most students don't want to lose—at anything. The idea of losing a grade bonus, even if it is mostly symbolic, triggers a strong emotional response. This can be useful: it forces students who have been assigned to the same team to meet together early on, and frequently; it also raises the emotional level of the game (conversely, if a faculty member wants to **lower** the emotional pitch, eliminating the grade bonus is one way to do so). (Most Reacting faculty include the grade bonus for the

highly-charged games set in ancient Athens, the French Revolution, and India in the 1940s: these were highly-charged historical moments.)

The "winner bonus" is very useful to the Gamemaster for other reasons as well. Sometimes the game design requires, for historical verisimilitude, that students take positions with which they have little sympathy. The game set in Ming China gives the emperor's First Grand Secretary, whose access to the treasury made him even more powerful than the emperor, the power to bribe two students by giving them a certificate guaranteeing their "winner bonus" if they follow the directions of the First Grand Secretary. This device alludes to the tremendous power of the First Grand Secretary, and highlights the moral dilemma that is at the heart of the game: is a government that helps protect and feed the people good, even if it fails to adhere to moral standards of propriety? But the bribe would not work—and about half the students refuse to accept it even WITH the guaranteed bonus—if it did not carry the winner bonus. There are other examples where the "bonus" enhances the dynamics of the game.

Some students regard the "winner bonus" as unnecessary; some claim that it even sullies the experience. "I was into my role and didn't need a bonus to persuade me to try to win," they say. Some students dislike the bonus because it generates more tension in a climate that is already somewhat tense.

Yet other students say that the absence of the bonus causes teams to ease off when a game reaches its emotional peak. The tendency in every game is for students to abandon the obdurate historical positions and become "reasonable"—to settle into the consensual paradigm that prevails on most campuses: "Look, you guys. Instead of all this arguing, let's just be reasonable and compromise. You want to convict and exile Hutchinson, and I want her acquitted. Let's just fine her and ask her to do a few months of community service." The winner bonus helps hold students to the partisan roles of the past.

The winner bonus also provides many interesting possibilities in game design. Whether to include it is, of course, the instructor's decision. But the recommendation of the Reacting faculty is to include the "winner bonus" in the initial game [usually the *Threshold of Democracy: Athens in 403 B.C.*], and then to think hard about whether to include it in the others.

THE POST-MORTEM SESSION

After the game has formally ended, another "post-mortem" class must be held to close it out. During the "post-mortem," the instructor—no longer Gamemaster—should outline what **really** happened (information contained in the instructor's manual for each game), and indicate at what points, if any, the game veered from history. This should precipitate a discussion about historical causation.

During the post-mortem, too, students should be forthcoming about their roles and goals and actions during the game.

Students should be encouraged, also, to get a fix to their "real" views on the role they played. They may have argued "x," but do they really believe it? Should they believe it?

Sometimes the final session can be a festive occasion, a "rite of incorporation" where the divisions of the factions are effaced. Soda and cookies, and perhaps a viewing of a Hollywood film on the topic, contribute to this type of feeling, bringing an end to one liminal experience and preparing the way for a new one just ahead.

Illustrative Problems

The following issues reflect the types of problems that sometimes surface in Reacting classes. Faculty may wish to ponder them.

IF STUDENTS ARE CONFUSED

> *It is the second meeting of the class, and students have just read through their individual "roles" in their first game, set in ancient Athens. They have glanced at Plato's Republic, and find it daunting. They have read through the background information, and they don't understand the workings of an Athenian democracy in which some people are slaves and others are randomly chosen to preside over the Assembly. They don't understand their "victory" objectives or how to achieve them. They can't quite imagine what happens during class. They glance at each other nervously, befuddled by it all. They're not even sure what question to ask right now.*

Reacting faculty have been surprised at the predictability of students' emotional response during a game. The progression is much the same from one class to another, from one instructor to another, from one college to another, and from one game to the next. Faculty should not be unsettled by this pattern.

During the first week, when the instructor sets the intellectual and historical context, distributes game materials and eventually assigns the roles, Reacting students are bewildered by it all.

The confusion persists during the second week, as students meet in factions. This confusion is an absolutely necessary and positive part of the Reacting experience. It persuades faction members that they need each other to figure out what's going on. This causes them to meet outside of class and exchange emails and phone calls. They become a team, and fast. The indeterminates, who do not function as a "faction" (their purposes are not similar) remain confused, and require reassurance and guidance. (See "The Problem of the Indeterminates.")

The public sessions of the games usually begin during the third week (fourth or fifth class session). Student leaders, such as the first Assembly president in Athens, the First Grand Secretary in Ming China, or the President of the National Assembly in revolutionary France—settle into their roles, and the bolder students begin to make their arguments. Often at this stage one student will read a speech aloud. Then someone from the other side will pose a question, and a rudimentary debate commences. When it loses steam, a second paper is read, and so on. Student leaders usually manage this nicely, with little guidance from the instructor. Sometimes in their presentations, students make mistakes,

either substantive (misunderstanding the ideas, and thus the text, from which their positions are derived) or strategic (they wander into a position that the other side can readily demolish).

By the fourth week, the structure of the game sequence is fairly clear, and most students know what to say. They make fewer errors. The teams now function effectively as members caucus, pass notes, and help each other during debates. The students' first papers have been corrected, and the instructor pushes students to strengthen their arguments.

By the fifth week, many students not only understand their positions, but at some cognitive level believe what they are saying. The arguments become charged and often heated. Absences from class are rare.

Insofar as this sequence has been so regular in different settings, faculty may assume something has gone wrong if their class fails to adhere to it. Some of the likely difficulties are listed below. One problem, not cited, is that during the fifth week, when most students have managed to inhabit their role, they are reluctant to let go of them. They may propose that the game continue additional sessions. This, too, is fairly common. Extensions should be discouraged if it they would necessitate shortening a subsequent game, because the same pressure will likely be encountered toward the end of it as well.

IF A GAME COMES TO A HALT

> *Governor Winthrop is ill and "his" deputy is unprepared for the job of running the General Court; she fumbles. The defenders of Anne Hutchinson exploit the confusion by making demands that further confuse the deputy. She looks to her teammates, who have also relied excessively on Winthrop, and they shrug their shoulders. The deputy looks imploring to the Gamemaster. . .*
>
> *Three members of the democratic faction in ancient Athens have decided to indict Socrates on a charge of impiety based on his words as cited in Plato's Republic. (The game rules hypothesize that Socrates did in fact say what Plato credits him with saying.) The three democrats go to the podium to make their arguments, but it turns out that they have misread or misinterpreted The Republic, much to the glee of the antidemocrats. The democrats, on realizing their error, become flummoxed. They must recast their arguments and are incapable of doing so on the spot. There is an awkward silence. The president of the Assembly has allocated 45 minutes to this subject and is now confused. He looks imploringly to the Gamemaster. . .*
>
> *The Wanli emperor has demanded that criticisms of "him" cease, on pain of death. The emperor's critics sit around the table and glower. The First Grand Secretary—an ally of the emperor—smiles contentedly. There is silence. . .*

Some Reacting faculty respond to situations such as these by intruding: calling a "time out" and giving a quick, impromptu lecture to explain what's gone wrong and why. Perhaps the instructor will: a) advise the deputy governor of "his" duties; b) give a brief

lecture explaining impiety in the context of *The Republic*; 3) warn the emperor that she is not to be so imperial.

Such intrusions are occasionally unavoidable. But they subvert nearly all of the psychological factors on which the Reacting pedagogy depends. Faculty intervention shatters liminality, intrudes upon the "past," and destroys the students' sense of empowerment.

When a crash occurs, perhaps the wisest approach is to unobtrusively suggest (perhaps with a note?) that the student-leader announce a fifteen-minute recess. During this period factions can caucus separately, allowing the instructor to meet with and advise the group that is having difficulty. If their errors are too great to be fixed promptly, the faculty member may wish to cancel the remainder of the "public" class and work to strengthen the struggling team's understanding of the text or its arguments or strategies. A warning that the poor performance may cause the team to lose indeterminate students, and thus the game, often inspires the team or its leaders to do better work in the future.

But "crashes" are infrequent. Most of the games have built in enough guidance to ensure that students will figure out what to do when they approach a logjam.

IF STUDENT SARCASM WOUNDS

> *A shy student has presented a paper indicting Anne Hutchinson for equating herself with God by imagining that she knows His purposes. The student has cited Anne's words and relevant Biblical citations; her reasoning and research is sound, the product of considerable effort; her oral presentation is solid and, though not powerful, effective. In real life, she is not a Puritan, and she does not "really" identify with Hutchinson's critics. But she has worked very hard on her argument and is proud of it. Then a clever debater who is defending Hutchinson picks the arguments apart, one by one: Anne's words were quoted out of context, or misconstrued; the Biblical passages do not support the student's claims; etc. etc. The debater characterizes one of the shy student's arguments as "ridiculous." The shy student's face reddens. The criticism has hurt her and everyone can see it. Some students look imploringly to the Gamemaster. . .*

Reacting is meant to generate a powerful emotional response; tempers sometimes flare and words sometimes wound, especially early in the semester. (This happens less often in subsequent games, as students learn more about each other, and how to speak and argue effectively.)

Sometimes Reacting faculty will intervene by speaking out for the beleaguered student. "But Anne has made a very good point, hasn't she?" Yet such intrusions often only underscore the student's and her team's failure to defend themselves. Some faculty prefer to remain silent in the corner, and then to praise the shy student afterwards for the quality of her argument, and perhaps give her suggestions for defending herself in the future—in Reacting, and in life. Or the faculty member may remind Anne's team that they are to work together and support each other.

The most pronounced "successes" of the pedagogy are among timid students. Quite frequently, the emotional context is so powerful that shy students are provoked to

overcome their shyness and speak as never before. Some shy students have told Reacting faculty that for many years they have wanted to speak forcefully in a class, and Reacting has impelled them to do so; for some timid students, Reacting has changed their lives, or so they report years later.

This is to say that stress, especially when protected by the armor of an artificial role and a supportive team, can be productive. Reacting students need considerable encouragement, and they need better skills. The instructor can provide both. The faculty's inclination to serve as an emollient to scraped sensibilities is understandable, and sometimes even essential. But these attentions might best come **after** class: abrasive students can be taught that their style often turns off other people; and those whose feelings are hurt can be reassured and their skills improved. But it usually wisest during public sessions to remain unobtrusive.

IF A STUDENT BECOMES OBNOXIOUS

> *A student exploits the fact that she is not "responsible" for her words and actions and hurls gross insults at other students, or employs inappropriate language or tone with the instructor. She justifies her offensive behavior on the grounds that she is merely "playing a role."*

Reacting students inhabit two worlds simultaneously: a modern college classroom, where certain standards of behavior usually prevail; and also an imaginary liminal world of the past. Most students intuitively understand that amiability and decency work best in both. However, Reacting faculty have in some rare cases found a student whose obnoxious behavior undermines an entire class. Usually quiet words from the instructor, outside the setting of the class itself, will suffice to set him straight; but in those instances where the student is incapable of checking his own behavior, the instructor—as Gamemaster—may wish to take advantage of the structures embedded in all social conventions (and thus in the game rules for those historical settings) to impose some measure of discipline upon abrasive students.

If, for example, a student in the *Athens in 403 B.C.* game is repeatedly abusive, the instructor may wish to remind the Assembly about **ostracism**, a provision included in ancient Athens (and in the game rules) to deal with precisely this situation. To initiate an ostracism, a student need only make a motion in favor of holding an ostracism vote. No names can or should be mentioned. If the majority of the Assembly votes to have such a vote, then everyone writes down the name of a person whom they wish to exile; the student whose name is mentioned by the most students would then be excluded from the remainder of the public debates (although she could still submit her papers). Abusive students in Massachusetts Bay Colony could be tried before the General Court or, if they were members of the church, by the Boston Church. The British Commissioners in India regularly imprisoned Indian leaders who proved too troublesome. The faculty member, seeking to protect students from abusive behavior, may advise the (student) officials in charge to initiate such measures. The pedagogical point is that all societies discipline wayward individuals; all societies enforce behavioral norms. Students should never imagine that they can contravene those norms with impunity. Even the British Governor of India could be recalled by the Prime Minister.

IF A CLASS DOES NOT SEEM TO GET "INTO" REACTING

> *An instructor, weary of listless, droopy-eyed students in his usual classes, takes on a Reacting class with high hopes and expectations. Yet halfway through the second game, some students are also listless and droopy-eyed. Most students read their papers in a monotone voice, betraying their disinterest in the materials—and in the course. Worse, the lethargy of the dull students dampens the enthusiasm of the others.*

Many students do not expect or even desire stimulation in **any** class. Whether the instructor cajoles or harangues or wisecracks, or reads from yellowing notes or fills the blackboard with data, some students sit back and endure it with obstreperous passivity. Many students have perfected an insouciant attitude that insulates them from whatever transpires in the classroom. They will do what they must (to pass, to graduate, to get an A), but they do so under psychic duress.

Those students bring their customary behavior to Reacting classes. Their aggressive lethargy intimidates students who find the experience novel and interesting, who want to be a part of a good team, or who simply want to win any competition. (See section on psychological factors in Reacting.)

Wary students are especially skeptical of pedagogical innovations. They've seen them before: classroom movies; learning through logging on; field trips. They are not impressed. Reacting strikes such students as akin to other innovations, only weirder and more ridiculous. They'd rather sit back in class and chew on a pencil than stand up and "pretend" to be a Confucian scholar or a Puritan divine, of all things.

Reacting employs a host of psychological mechanisms to force students out of their protective shells, but these devices are not uniformly efficacious. Yet a fair number of students retain some skepticism toward Reacting.

Experience shows, however, that with each class the number of resistant students declines. Even the skeptics usually get drawn in. A good test is classroom attendance: in Reacting classes, classroom attendance is usually higher than in other classes; most faculty report that in the final sessions of any game, nearly everyone attends. Moreover, while attendance in most lectures and seminars declines over the course of a semester, attendance in Reacting generally increases. By the third game, Reacting seems to take hold among some, but not all, of the resistant students. Some students recall specific moments when they have been "won over": when a game takes a twist they find intriguing; when they are assigned a difficult role that imposes a grave challenge; when they form a social bond with a faction that wins (or loses) a close game; when they stand at the podium and, angered by a sharp question, speak out with intensity in a classroom setting for the first time in their lives.

Reacting, in short, is a psychological contest for the minds of students, especially the withdrawn or shy ones. How can faculty determine whether their class is becoming more or less engaged? There are several strong indicators of failure: 1) use of past tense—"Winthrop thought that. . ."; 2) diminishing attendance: the absence of more than two students in the final sessions of any game is unusual; 3) evaluations that, after the second game, are only tepid; 4) the failure of shy or withdrawn students to enter debates freely, without being obliged to give presentations.

Some shy students object to these criteria for "success." In a post-mortem discussion, for example, one student conceded that her participation, compared to other students, was not impressive. "But it is wrong for you to assume that I wasn't engaged," she said. "I went throughout high school, and every other class in college, without speaking voluntarily. Yet in Reacting I **did** enter the debates, though maybe not so much as others. And I organized all of the faction meetings outside of class and then I spoke all of the time. I was completely engaged and cared desperately about the outcome."

It is appealing to imagine that students who **appear** to be listless are, in reality, animatedly enthusiastic. On the other hand, the student who seems to be bored may **be** bored. Reacting does not ensure complete success; the problem is that its failures are evident and distracting. The student who dozes in a lecture or traditional seminar hardly stands out at all; in Reacting, however, such a person attracts attention and undermines the class's psychological dynamics.

Instructors (and student preceptors), can promote the engagement of shy, withdrawn, or skeptical students in several different ways. Reacting places students in stressful situations, intensifying their sense of vulnerability; such students need considerable reassurance. Faculty may wish to congratulate, or (more privately) send congratulatory e-mails to those who summon up the courage to first speak in an adversarial setting. Because the instructor will likely sit quietly in a corner during the classes, moreover, students may regard her as judgmental and foreboding. Smiles and nods, and a willingness to laugh with everyone else, help convey a more supportive image.

Even more importantly, faculty should meet individually with students, especially those in leadership positions or whose roles are particularly odd or difficult. The instructor may wish to challenge students: "The real supporters of Anne Hutchinson **lost** and she was banished. You **must** find a way to save her." Or to encourage them: "This role is very difficult. I'm not sure how you should proceed. Why don't you send me several e-mails outlining your plans and arguments **before** you make them to the whole class?" In short, students perform better if they sense that the instructor is an active (if mostly silent) observer.

Reacting Preceptors, too, should focus on their charges' successes and accomplishments. Students may feel that it is bad enough that adversarial factions pick their work apart, and in public! It is worse that their instructors and mentors do so, too. Discussion of "what went wrong," whether in speaking or writing, is essential. How else can one learn? Preceptors, like the instructors, must "correct" students, but they should be mindful of the Reacting students' sense of vulnerability.

IF A STUDENT FEELS DECEIVED BY THE INSTRUCTOR / GM

> *A leader of the Athenian democrats asks the Gamemaster whether the democrats should eliminate property qualifications for citizenship. The instructor, knowing that the argument resonates with an important idea in Plato's Republic, encourages this initiative because it will bring the text more directly into the debates. But during the debate, the democrats learn that two of the indeterminates are substantial property-holders; the proposed democratic legislation offends them. The democratic leader looks at the Gamemaster,*

aghast, and asks: "Why did you recommend this initiative when you knew some of the indeterminates would oppose it? You've tricked us!"

Because the Gamemaster is helping opposing sides simultaneously, and sometimes promoting the game for pedagogical reasons rather than the interests of any particular faction, some students may view the instructor as duplicitous. One way to avoid confusion is for the faculty member to demarcate when he is behaving like a perfectly neutral helper, and when he is promoting the interests of the game (for whatever pedagogical reasons). Some Reacting faculty retain this distinction in all contacts with students.

The Reacting instructor might wish to explain at the outset that she has two separate roles: as "Instructor," she is her "real self" whose chief responsibility is to help and guide students; as "Gamemaster," on the other hand, she becomes part of the game where her chief responsibility is to create a powerful and credible educational experience. As Instructor, she will speak freely and openly; as Gamemaster, she will not tell one side what the other is planning. She may further choose to clearly indicate when she is performing each role. When a student sends an e-mail requesting assistance on how to improve paragraph structure, the instructor may sign her response, "Instructor Jones." But when the student seeks advice on game strategy, the instructor may sign it, "Gamemaster Jones." Clarity avoids confusion and hurt feelings.

A further necessary distinction: all grading should be done by the "instructor."

IF A STUDENT FEELS DECEIVED BY ANOTHER STUDENT

Two roommates are in the same Reacting class that is playing "Rousseau, Burke and Revolution in France, 1791": one student is an indeterminate, the other is a member of Jacobins. The Jacobin works hard to persuade her roommate to support the Jacobins and oppose the constitutional monarchy of the moderates. The indeterminate student agrees to do this but secretly works with King Louis XVI and the counterrevolutionaries. During a critical moment, the indeterminate casts her votes with the counterrevolutionary faction. The Jacobin glares at her roommate. "But you told me," she says, eyes flashing…

In Reacting, students pretend to be something they are not; this occasionally creates difficulties when their "real" role—as companionable roommate, for example—conflicts with their game role. In real life, liminal situations are customarily demarcated in a clear way: Children are obliged to wear costumes while trick-or-treating, and religious ceremonies are performed in visually distinct structures—churches or synagogues or mosques, places whose appearance signifies that something special is going on and that normal roles and rules do not apply.

Reacting faculty and students have debated the possibility of clearly delineating when Reacting students are "in" game mode (behaving in their assigned "role") and "out" of it (behaving like their "real" self as a college student). This would help eliminate misunderstandings with roommates and others. Some propose that particular locations be defined as liminal, and students inhabiting those spaces can be presumed to be "in" their game mode. Some veteran Reacting students object to this: "During a game, I am **always** in my role, whether I'm in class or discussing it at dinner. That should be taken

for granted." This is a difficult matter. Each class should at least discuss the issue, and perhaps set its own rules, to alert students at the outset of the potential problem. It may be useful to discuss this issue during the "set-up" period of the first game.

IF STUDENTS COME TO RELY TOO MUCH ON A BRILLIANT LEADER

> *One student leader in a team masters the materials and the context, and proves adept at negotiation and strategizing. During class sessions, she makes the strongest presentations; when another member of her team gives a presentation and fumbles during the subsequent questionings, this team-leader steps in to help her out. Soon, the entire team relaxes, knowing that their talented peer has matters firmly in hand. They can sit back and applaud her spirited performance.*
>
> *Students on different teams become unusually passionate about their roles, and they seem to argue them with an unusual intensity. The instructor worries that the usual Reacting process of engagement with a role has gone too far, and that students are losing some measure of critical detachment. They not only "believe" what they say, but they believe it fervently.*

Both situations pose a pedagogical problem: Reacting seeks to promote engagement, and one means of doing this is through the psychological dynamics of a team. A good team will pressure lazy students to do their best and will distribute work so that everyone is productive. But in Reacting—as in history (and life more generally)—a brilliant leader can do it all.

A brilliant leader is a crucial variable in history, and Reacting often provides vivid illustrations of this truth. But a brilliant leader also can impede the engagement of other students. Sometimes there is little an instructor or Gamemaster can do but sit back and enjoy the superstar's performance.

An unusual degree of engagement with a role, however, can impede a student's understanding. Part of the purpose of Reacting is to show students the extent to which everyone can persuade themselves of what they are obliged to believe. But this lesson requires that students maintain some degree of critical distance from their role.

In both of the cited examples, the instructor can remedy the problem by shaking things up. This can be accomplished through heavy-handed intervention: by unilaterally shifting the student-leader to become a member of an opposed faction, or by shuffling over-engaged teams in the middle of a game: Email to Brilliant Leader: "Bad news: you were run over by a coach. Good news: You have been brought back. But are no longer a Radical Democrat; now you are a landowning Oligarch." Often the brilliant leader enjoys the new challenge.

Students are usually appalled by this sort of heavy-handedness. It encroaches on their sense of empowerment and it shatters their team.

But sometimes the Gamemaster may feel that the good to be achieved by role shifts outweighs these factors. Moreover, some Reacting games have embedded in the rules the possibility of role-shifts. For example, in *Rousseau, Burke, and Revolution in France, 1791*, the mob of Paris will likely intimidate some nobility and high-ranking clergy,

causing them to flee Paris—and the National Assembly. As conservative members depart from the assembly (and thus from the game), they are "reincarnated" by means of secret game rules as Jacobin radicals: To win, they must now take positions opposite those they had maintained earlier; and the conservative team must now find new leaders.

Several other games include the possibility of leaders being deposed, arrested, or killed; but such possibilities are included in the game only when they were also a part of the actual history. The problem of recruiting new leaders is itself a crucial issue in many volatile historical situations. In addition to replicating the actual historical dynamics, this device also forces teams to reconstitute their leadership and also to perceive what it is like to argue against a position one had earlier advanced fervently.

IF A STUDENT DECLINES TO PLAY A ROLE FOR RELIGIOUS OR ETHICAL REASONS

> *You have distributed roles for the Trial of Anne Hutchinson game. After class, a student approaches you hesitantly. She explains that she is a Jehovah's Witness whose beliefs prevent her from taking on a role as a Puritan because she would be professing trinitarian notions that, in her faith, are wrong.*
>
> *You have distributed roles for the Rousseau, Burke, and Revolution in France game. After class, a student explains that she has been assigned a role as a leader of the Parisian mob. She is a pacifist and can never support violence.*
>
> *You have distributed roles for the Defining a Nation: India on the Eve of Independence game. After class, a Muslim (or Hindu) student explains that she cannot articulate the viewpoints expressed in her assigned role as a radical Hindu (or Muslim).*

Reacting encourages students to **empathize** with ideas different from their own. The pedagogical assumptions are, first, that we best understand the world by understanding those who have made it what it is; and, second, that we best understand other people by seeing the world through their eyes.

The fact is that we view the world through lenses ground from the stuff of our social and cultural experiences. The images that become seared upon our brain are not merely our perceptions. Our vision of ourselves is shaped by those images.

Reacting provides students with a variety of alternative eyeglasses; by seeing things differently, we will seem them more richly. A corollary assumption is that students who regard others from multiple perspectives will acquire a deeper understanding of their **own** views.

But what of the student who is certain of her own identity? What, especially, of the student whose own identity largely conforms to a particular set of religious, ethnic, or moral values?

When confronted with questions such as those posed at the beginning of this section, Reacting faculty should discuss the matter with the student privately. The instructor may wish to reassure the student that the assumption of a particular role—the putting on of a

different intellectual lens—is merely play-acting; the instructor might even promise to issue a public disclaimer before the public sessions along the following lines: "What is said in this 'game' constitutes mere role-playing. As with the other 'Reacting games,' no one is expressing his 'own' views: we are all playing roles that have no relation to our own 'beliefs'." In the private discussion, moreover, instructors may suggest that the acquisition of knowledge always entails a broadening of one's intellectual horizons. Can students truly explore difference if they cling so tightly to the cultural lens they acquired during childhood?

Such points may be provocative and salutary; but they cannot be pushed too far. Students may contend, with Plato, that "play-acting" can lead to the moral rot of falsity. Experience shows, moreover, that by the end of a game most students come to "believe" at some cognitive level that which they argue. Reacting is more than "play-acting." Once one has peered through a different lens, one sees differently. So the instructor must be prepared either to withdraw such a student from the game and place her in some "juror" function, or perhaps, more subtly, to assign her an "observer" role in which she need not say anything that might conflict with her beliefs.

The easiest device for nearly any game is to add a new role as "historian." The "historian" can function as an indeterminate, or otherwise be entirely "out" of the decision-making and debating aspects of the game. The "historian" can participate in the game indirectly, gathering notes from the meetings of the various factions and researching the actual past. These materials would culminate in her final "essay" (i.e., ten-page paper) outlining what transpired in the game. Her own work might resonate with the writings of actual historians during the period.

Here, for example, is a sample "historian" or "diarist" part for a student who declines to assume a role in the *Trial of Anne Hutchinson* game:

> You were born in 1610 in London. You are of a modest family of rent collectors and farmers in rural Huntingdon; your mother's father was a butcher at Whitechapel. You were educated at local schools and, showing great promise, were given a scholarship to attend Magdalene College. You flourished there, took a B.A. in 1633 and received employment as a secretary to a cousin, the First Earl of Sandwich. The Earl was offered a large grant of land in Massachusetts Bay Colony but he declined the rigors of a voyage to inspect it, and sent you in his stead.
>
> You ventured over on a ship whose passenger were mostly, if not wholly, Puritan immigrants. Now winter has set in and the next ship will not return to England until April at the earliest. Your task of inspecting the wilds will take little of your time, so instead you have decided to examine closely this Puritan experiment. This will afford you the opportunity to cultivate your skills, and further you real ambition: to become a person of letters, a writer of literature.
>
> You have little interest in the outcome of the theological debates over Anne Hutchinson, but you can see that your account of what transpires will be of interest to readers in London. So you have resolved to attend sessions of the General Court, to attend sessions of the Boston Church (on the latter, you have no choice: attendance of all inhabitants of Boston is required by law), and to meet with the principal characters in the dispute.

The purpose of your intense observations is to write a diary containing your reflections on the Trial of Anne Hutchinson. You will not simply write a dry narrative: this happened, and then that. Instead, you will elevate the writing of a diary to a literary form: you will focus on the telling detail—the personality of a disputant; the expressions of the adversaries in the Boston congregation; the appearance of rude Boston. These details will further your interpretation of the events that unfold before you. Your diary, in short, will not be a series of disconnected episodes, but a sequence of perceptions and observations that advance a thesis about the Puritan experiment as it unfolds in the Boston Church and the Boston General Court during February and March, 1638.

ADVISORY: To acquire more details on the nature of life in Boston, you should reread Edmund Morgan's The Puritan Dilemma, and perhaps John Demos's *A Little Commonwealth*, which provides details of a different order (childrearing, housing, personality) about nearby Plymouth colony. But you should especially sample the *Diary of Samuel Pepys* (pronounced PEEPS), born in 1633 in circumstances not unlike your own. Pepys's diary is regarded as one of the finest ever written; you may learn some writerly tricks from it. It also provides many "period piece" details which, though drawn from London, may prove useful to you.

Special Note: In some games (India, for example), students are assigned to teams that include secular and religious components. This allows students some measure of "choice": for example, in the India game, three students are assigned to the Muslim League: one is an Islamic fundamentalist; another is a Muslim who seeks secular rule. A student who had difficulty with Islamic fundamentalism would likely opt for the secularist position. Yet faculty should remember that Reacting is about persuading students to think more broadly, rather than fitting the roles to accommodate student preconceptions.

IF A GAME DIVERGES FROM HISTORY

France, 1791: Lafayette is played by a brilliant leader, who puts down the Parisian mob, persuades the Catholic Church and the King to accept a mostly titular monarchy, holds the moderate (Feuillant) faction together, and persuades most indeterminates of the merits of a constitutional monarchy . Louis XVI remains King, and France experiences no reign of Terror.

India, 1945: The students playing Dr. Ambedkar, leader of the Untouchables, and the leader of the Sikhs also decide not to ally with Congress Party (INC). Both groups instead work out a deal and become part of the Muslim League.

In history, it worked out differently. Lafayette was a political bungler and ineffective orator; and Ambedkar and the Sikhs allied with INC, to their subsequent chagrin.

Reacting allows students to rework the past. Indeed, part of the appeal of Reacting is for students to **change** history (a source of empowerment!). This benefit brings a problem as well. If one function of Reacting is to teach history, then students will learn the **wrong history** of the above two historical moments. The instructor is obliged, of course, to take

advantage of the final, "post-mortem" session to show in what ways the game diverged from history.

The ahistoricity of some games possess a useful function, too, in that it introduces students to the problem of contingency. The past did not have to happen as it did. People are not flotsam, carried helplessly along by the tidal forces of history. Rather, the actions of individual figures decisively influence the course of human affairs, as do the vagaries of accident and chance.

This is an argument with which most professional historians are uncomfortable. They prefer to make the study of the past comprehensible by delineating the larger forces that move events forward. The quirks of individual personality or of chance subvert this coherence and make the study of the past particularistic and antiquarian. The design of a Reacting game tries to replicate the larger historical forces, but it leaves room for individuals to shape history, to **change** history. All Reacting games are contingent: those who lost in history can win, and the historical winners can lose, or something entirely unexpected can happen. This prospect is unsettling, especially to Reacting faculty who are historians, because it raises the possibility that students will remember not that Lafayette bungled but that he established a constitutional monarchy!

Reacting games stimulate "what if" discussions, and these provoke further reflection on the nature of historical causation, the role of the individual (and of chance) in history, and the like. Most Reacting games are based on the collision of important ideas: but the ideas relate to contemporary actions and policies. Thought and action are not divorced historically; and Reacting games, while focused on intellectual debate, allow student-players to take some actions: the members of the Athenian assembly may propose legislation and initiate legal actions; the Wanli emperor may adopt policies to control floods or bandits, or even execute wayward academicians; the chief defender of Anne Hutchinson may propose that their faction withdraw from Boston.

Instructors should allow students to undertake actions that are historically credible, and even devise new rules to accommodate their initiatives. All of the games pose intellectual dilemmas whose resolution bedeviled the actual participants; students will often prefer to take some action to find a way out of the dilemma, but faculty should do their best to keep the ideas at the heart of the class. Historical contingency is interesting, educational, and it is a powerful motivator; but Reacting is about ideas; historical pyrotechnics should not be allowed to obscure this basic point.

IF A HEATED SESSION DEVOLVES INTO CHAOS

> *Simla, in the Himalayas, 1945: The leaders of seven or eight different religious groups and factions meet with British colonial officials to determine what type of nation will exist once the British withdraw from the Indian subcontinent. The groups have been arguing heatedly through six public sessions and time is running out. The Muslim League can see no way to avoid Hindu domination of the subcontinent, and the League threatens to plunge the subcontinent into religious strife and even civil war, an outcome that will likely cause nearly everyone to fail to attain their "victory objectives." Nerves are frayed. The Indian National Congress, which contains secular and religious groups, is badly divided, and its members are arguing amongst themselves in a corner. Gandhi is*

trying to calm the Sikhs and the Untouchables, who fear that they will be swallowed up in a Hindu (or Muslim) majority. The leader of the Muslim League demands to be heard. Various factions are heatedly conferring in the hallway outside the room; and there is shouting within. A group jostles for position at the head of the line at the podium. The British Commissioners struggle to impose order on the proceedings and cannot. Another faculty member glances in, perplexed by the pandemonium. . .

Because we get our notions of the past chiefly from books, we sometimes imagine that the collision of ideas operated on a cerebral plane. But important ideas were forged in the heat of impassioned debate and intense, even bloody, struggle. Reacting classes often replicate the emotionally charged character of intellectual confrontation. On the other hand, the ideas conveyed in Plato's *Republic,* Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France,* and Gandhi's treatises on non-violence, among other works, require sober reflection and concentration; their points are subtle and difficult. The heat of the classes may provoke confusion.

Though we are episodically capable of bloody civil war and heated internecine strife, Americans have been reared on consensus. For many, heated argument contravenes a student ethos of bland agreeableness: "Whatever," or, "Don't go there." This agreeableness often descends upon seminars, an appealing narcoleptic that inhibits thought. We perhaps err in assuming that a quiet class, or one that is studiously scribbling the words of the professor, is a reflective one. Sometimes students need to know that ideas matter before the ideas can be taken seriously.

Yet Reacting faculty may be unsettled by a raucous class, and students sometimes complain that they cannot think when others are shouting (at them, especially). The easiest way to calm things down is to pass a note to the student-leader(s) and encourage her/them to declare a recess. (This was actually what the British colonial officials did in 1945-1946, preferring quiet one-to-one discussions to the angry chaos of full sessions.) This may provide an opportunity for groups to arrange a compromise, or for students simply to settle down and think through their positions. But Reacting faculty may be obliged to allow a greater range of student response than they are accustomed to.

IF A SESSION BECOMES WEIRD

It is the Forbidden City within Beijing, 1587. The Wanli emperor, enraged that his foremost advisers—the Hanlin academicians—have ignored his orders that they desist in their criticisms of his plan to name his third son (rather than the oldest) as his successor. Because Hanlin academicians' behavior was unfilial, and thus an affront to the views of Confucius, the emperor has ordered the execution of two of them. They are summarily executed, their harsh, carping voices forever silenced. But in the next session of the Hanlin academy, with the Wanli emperor in attendance, the ghosts of the dead academicians appear, some sprawled upon the table, some crawling beneath it. Writing appears on the walls of the palace—denunciations of the Wanli; and the ghosts intone their defiance of him. The Wanli's savvy First Grand Secretary frantically skims through her copy of the Analects of Confucius, and reads passages that express skepticism over the palpable existence of the spirit world. And then she performs a rite of banishment. Everyone looks over to the Gamemaster. . .

A different version of the Wanli game: the Gamemaster has invited another faculty member to observe the class. The Gamemaster, acting as "tutor to the emperor," has asked the "emperor" to allow the faculty member to observe the Hanlin session, and the "emperor" has agreed. At the outset of that session, the Gamemaster introduces this faculty member as a scholar from the world of the Western barbarians. Everyone laughs, the emperor gives some brief words of welcome, and the session proceeds much one would expect. But at the beginning of the next session, one Hanlin academician, a consistent critic of the Wanli, notes that no barbarian had ever before been allowed to witness the proceedings of the Hanlin. The emperor's action in admitting the barbarian was yet another example of his neglect of tradition and Confucian precepts. The emperor, believing that the Gamemaster has orchestrated this embarrassment, demands that the "tutor"—the Gamemaster—be exiled to Szechuan.

Reacting classes will sometimes go weird. Usually when students conceive of some weird solution to a difficult problem, they do not inform the instructor lest their scheme be quashed in advance. Once during the French Revolution game, a group of noblemen, seeking to defeat a provision of the Constitution of 1791 eliminating hereditary ranks, justified their preferred status on the grounds of their special contribution to arts and sciences: they pulled out violins and a cello and played a Bach partita for strings during a session of the National Assembly. During a recess of another session of that game, different factions caucused in the cafeteria; soon a spontaneous debate over the proposed constitution developed between one group in the balcony and another below. The other students in the cafeteria stared, wide-eyed.

An instructor's first reaction to weirdness may be to suppress it. Reacting faculty and students agree that sometimes the instructor must act as a policeman, intervening in heated disputes, cutting off far-fetched or historically implausible initiatives, and extinguishing excessive weirdness. But the consensus, among students and faculty, is for some degree of indulgence. The weird moments are often the ones that remain stuck in students' heads for years. Some students also insist that they should solve "their own problems," a sense of proprietorship that is often salutary but leaves faculty uncomfortable.

A compromise position: the instructor, as Gamemaster, may wish to inform students that he or she is willing to entertain innovation, and even change the rules to include it in the game, if the innovators can make a persuasive case as to its plausibility. Did many of the French nobility play musical instruments and, if so, did they play Bach? Questions of this nature push students further into the actual details of the past, and this also buys time for the Gamemaster to figure what to do.

Appendix A: List of Current Games

THE "REACTING TO THE PAST" SERIES

The Threshold of Democracy: Athens in 403 B.C.
Josiah Ober and Mark C. Carnes

The Threshold of Democracy: Athens in 403 B.C. recreates the intellectual dynamics of one of the most formative periods in the human experience. After nearly three decades of war, Sparta crushed democratic Athens, destroyed its great walls and warships, occupied the city, and installed a brutal regime, "the Thirty Tyrants." The excesses of the tyrants resulted in civil war and, as the game begins, they have been expelled and the democracy restored. But doubts about democracy remain, expressed most ingeniously by Socrates and his young supporters. Will Athens retain a political system where all decisions are made by an Assembly of 6,000 or so citizens? Will leaders continue to be chosen by random lottery? Will citizenship be broadened to include slaves who fought for the democracy and foreign-born metics who paid taxes in its support? Will Athens rebuild its long walls and warships and again extract tribute from city-states throughout the eastern Mediterranean?

These and other issues are sorted out by a polity fractured into radical and moderate democrats, oligarchs, and Socratics, among others. The debates are informed by Plato's *Republic*, as well as excerpts from Thucydides, Xenophon, and other contemporary sources. By examining democracy at its threshold, the game provides the perspective to consider its subsequent evolution.

Josiah Ober is David Magie Professor of Classics at Princeton University where he also holds a joint appointment in the Center for Human Values. He is the author of several books on classical Athenian political and intellectual history, most recently *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens* (Princeton University Press). He is now working on a project about the relationship between democratic political culture and the social circulation of knowledge. **Mark C. Carnes** is Ann Whitney Olin Professor of History at Barnard College and author of many books in American history, including *The American Nation*, also published by Longman. He is also General Editor of the 25-volume *American National Bio*graphy, published by the ACLS and Oxford University Press.

Confucianism and the Succession Crisis of the Wanli emperor, 1587
Daniel K. Gardner and Mark C. Carnes

Confucianism and the Succession Crisis of the Wanli Emperor seeks to introduce undergraduate students to the suppleness and power of Confucian thought as applied to issues of governance during the Ming dynasty. The game is set in the Hanlin Academy. Most students are members of the Grand Secretariat of the Hanlin Academy, the body of top-ranking graduates of the civil service

examination who serve as advisers to the Wanli emperor. Some Grand Secretaries are Confucian "purists," who hold that tradition obliges the emperor to name his first-born son as successor; others, in support of the most senior of the Grand Secretaries, maintain that it is within the emperor's right to choose his successor; and still others, as they decide this matter among many issues confronting the empire, continue to scrutinize the teachings of Confucianism for guidance. The game unfolds amidst the secrecy and intrigue within the walls of the Forbidden City, as scholars struggle to apply Confucian precepts to a dynasty in peril.

Daniel K. Gardner is Professor of Chinese History at Smith College and the author of many books and articles on the Confucian and Neo-Confucian tradition in China. His most recent book is *Zhu Xi's Reading of the Analects: Canon, Commentary, and the Classical Tradition* (Columbia University Press, 2003). (Refer to page 38 for information about **Mark C. Carnes**.)

This game has benefited enormously from the suggestions, questions, and research of countless students and faculty colleagues. We especially acknowledge Cynthia Brokaw, Chelsea Marshall, Richard Millington, Kristina Milnor, Herbert Sloan, Rosalind Rosenberg, Thaddeus Russell, and Lara Vapnek. Professor Edward Farmer of the University of Minnesota consulted on an early version of this game.

The Trial of Anne Hutchinson: Liberty, Law, and Intolerance in Puritan New England
Michael P. Winship and Mark C. Carnes

The Trial of Anne Hutchinson recreates one of the most tumultuous and significant episodes in early American history: the struggle between the followers and allies of John Winthrop, Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and those of Anne Hutchinson, a strong-willed and brilliant religious dissenter. The controversy pushed Massachusetts to the brink of collapse and spurred a significant exodus. The puritans who founded Massachusetts were poised between the Middle Ages and the modern world, and in many ways, they helped to bring the modern world into being. *The Trial of Anne Hutchinson* plunges participants into a religious world that will be unfamiliar to many of them. Yet the puritans' passionate struggles over how far they could tolerate a diversity of religious opinions in a colony committed to religious unity were part of a larger historical process that led to religious freedom and the modern concept of separation of church and state. Their vehement commitment to their liberties and fears about the many threats these faced were passed down to the American Revolution and beyond.

Michael P. Winship is professor of History at the University of Georgia and the author of the highly acclaimed Making *Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton, 2002), the definitive study of Hutchinson and the controversies around her. (Refer to page 38 for information about **Mark C. Carnes**.)

In addition to the many students and faculty who have contributed to the development of this game, the authors especially note the assistance of Lisa Gordis and David Henderson.

Rousseau, Burke, and Revolution in France, 1791
Mark C. Carnes and Gary Kates

Rousseau, Burke, and Revolution in France, 1791 plunges students into the intellectual political and ideological currents that surged through revolutionary Paris in the summer of 1791. Students are leaders of major factions within the National Assembly (and in the streets outside) as it struggles to create a constitution amidst internal chaos and threats of foreign invasion. Will the king retain power? Will the priests of the Catholic Church obey the "general will" of the National Assembly or the dictates of the pope in Rome? Do traditional institutions and values constitute restraints on freedom and individual dignity or are they its essential bulwarks?

Are slaves, women, and Jews entitled to the "rights of man"? Is violence a legitimate means of changing society or of purging it of dangerous enemies? In wrestling with these issues, students consult Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Social Contract* and Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, among other texts.

Gary Kates is Professor of History and Dean of the College at Pomona College. He is the author of *The Cercle Social, the Girondins, and the French Revolution* (Princeton, 1985) and editor of *The French Revolution: Recent Debates and New Controversies* (New York, 1998). He has served on the editorial board of French Historical Studies. In 1995 the Knight-Ridder News Service named his book, *Monsieur d'Eon is a Woman: A Tale of Sexual Masquerade and Political Intrigue*, as one of the top non-fiction books of that year. (Refer to page 38 for information about **Mark C. Carnes**.)

Galileo and the New Cosmology
Frederick Purnell, Jr. and Mark C. Carnes

In *Galileo and the New Cosmology* the new science, as brilliantly propounded by Galileo, collides with the elegant cosmology of Aristotle, Aquinas, and medieval Scholasticism. The game is set in Rome in the early decades of the 17th century. The action shifts from the Holy Office, the arm of the papacy that supervises the Roman Inquisition, to the palace of Prince Cesi, founder of the Society of the Lynx-Eyed for promoting the new science. Some students are faculty of the Collegio Romano and the secular University of Rome, the Sapienza, but most are Cardinals who seek to defend the faith from resurgent Protestantism, the imperial ambitions of the Spanish monarch, the schemes of the Medici in Florence, and a crisis of faith throughout Christendom. Some embrace the "new cosmology," some denounce it, and still others are undecided. The issues range from the nature of faith and the meaning of the Bible to the scientific principles and methods as advanced by Copernicus, Kepler, Tycho Brahe, Giordano Bruno, and Galileo. The central texts include: Aristotle's *Physics*; Galileo's *Starry Messenger* (1610); a newly-translated treatise in defense of celestial change by

the theologian Giovanni Battista Agocchi; the declarations of the Council of Trent; and the Bible.

Frederick Purnell, Jr. is Professor of Philosophy at Queens College and The Graduate Center of the City University of New York. A specialist in Renaissance and early modern thought, he has published numerous articles based on his research in European libraries and archives. His work has emphasized the relationship between philosophy and science in the late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, with particular attention to thinkers with ties to Galileo Galilei. (Refer to page 38 for information about **Mark C. Carnes**.)

Defining a Nation: India on the Eve of Independence, 1945
Ainslie T. Embree and Mark C. Carnes

Defining a Nation: India on the Eve of Independence,1945 is set at Simla, in the foothills of the Himalayas, where the British viceroy has invited leaders of various religious and political constituencies to work out the future of Britain's largest colony. Will the British transfer power to the Indian National Congress, which claims to speak for all Indians? Or will a separate Muslim state—Pakistan—be carved out of India to be ruled by Muslims, as the Muslim League proposes? And what will happen to the vulnerable minorities—such as the Sikhs and untouchables—or the hundreds of princely states? As British authority wanes, smoldering tensions among Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs increasingly flare into violent riots that threaten to ignite all India. Towering above it all is the frail but formidable figure of Gandhi, whom some revere as an apostle of non-violence, and others regard as a conniving Hindu politician. Students struggle to reconcile religious identity with nation building—perhaps the most intractable and important issue of the modern world. Texts include the literature of Hindu revival (Chatterjee, Tagore and Tilak); the Koran and the literature of Islamic nationalism (Iqbal); and the writings of Ambedkar, Nehru, Jinnah, and Gandhi.

Ainslie T. Embree is Professor of History Emeritus at Columbia University, former president of American Institute of Asian Studies and of the Association of Asian Studies. He also served as Counselor for Cultural Affairs at the American Embassy in Delhi. His books include, *India's Search for National Identity* (1972), *Imagining India* (1989), *Utopias in Conflict: Religion and Nationalism in India* (1990). He was also editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopedia of Asian History* (1988). (Refer to page 38 for information about **Mark C. Carnes**.)

GAMES IN DEVELOPMENT

Kansas Board of Education 1999: Evolution and Creationism
David E. Henderson

It is 1999 and Christian Conservatives on the Kansas Board of Education have deleted macroevolution and Big Bang cosmology from the state science curriculum. The game centers on the election of a new Board of Education which must, for legal reasons, revisit

the decision. Students will campaign for office through press conferences and sponsored debates, and are encouraged to involve the larger campus community in the issues. Following the election, the Board meets to resolve the science curriculum issue. Many students also have secondary goals on which they will seek action by the Board.

The controversy in Kansas lies on a continuum that begins with the trial of Galileo; most states in the South and Midwest have struggled with this issue and even New York limits the teaching of evolution. The Kansas controversy is uniquely interesting. It coincided with the controversial presidential election of 2000 in which both candidates took sides on the issue. It was also part of a struggle for control within the Republican Party of Kansas and involved large numbers of outside interests and national attention for the controversy.

This game raises many questions about the role of religion in American society, the power of religious fundamentalism in the modern world, and the nature of science. Faculty can tailor the course to focus more on issues of civil religion or on modern Cosmology and evolutionary theory. Readings include an excerpt from Darwin's *Origin of Species*, *Microcosmos* by Lynn Margulis and Doran Sagen, which presents a modern view of evolution, readings from Hume on natural religion, and a classic essay on civil religion in America.

David E. Henderson is Professor of Chemistry at Trinity College in Hartford, CT. He led the development of the Interdisciplinary Science Program at Trinity, which had among its goals the introduction of science students to both scientific and societal controversies in science. He is currently Director of the Environmental Science Program. Prof. Henderson grew up in the South where he gained first hand experience with various fundamentalist Christian groups. He is also very interested in the scientific study of the origin of life on the one hand and on the early history of the Christian church on the other.

The American Revolution in New York City, 1775-76
William Offutt

The American Revolution in New York City, 1775-76 draws students into the political and social chaos of a revolutionary New York City, where patriot and loyalist forces argued and fought for advantage among a divided populace. Can students realize the liminal world of chaos, disruption, loss of privacy, and fear of victimization that come with any revolution accompanied by violence? How do both the overall outcome and the intermediate "surprises" that reflect the shift of events in 1775-76 demonstrate the role of contingency in history? Could the Brits still win? What were the complexities, strengths, and weaknesses of the arguments on both sides? How were these affected by the social circumstances in which the Revolution occurred?

Students engage with the ideological foundations of revolution and government through close readings of Locke, Paine, and other contemporary arguments. Each student's ultimate victory goal is to have his/her side in control of New York City at the end of 1776 (not as of the end of the Revolution, when all know who won), as well as to achieve certain individual goals (e.g., slaves can attain freedom, propertied women can be granted voting rights, laborers can make deals for land). Winning requires the ability to master the high politics arguments for and against revolution as well as the low political skills of

logrolling, bribery, and threatened force. Military force often determines the winner, much to the surprise of the students who concentrated merely on internal game politics.

Bill Offutt is Director of the Pforzheimer Honors College and Associate Professor of History at Pace University. His book, *Of Good Laws and Good Men: Law and Society in the Delaware Valley 1680-1710*, was published in 1995. His academic interests focus on the relationship between law and society, particularly the methods by which legal systems obtain and keep their legitimacy. He has taught classes in colonial America, revolutionary America, the Civil War, Constitutional history, and American women's history. The American Revolution game is paired with the "Anne Hutchinson" game to form a Reacting course under an existing course for freshmen at Pace entitled "The Early American Legacy."

Henry VIII and the Reformation Parliament
J. Patrick Coby

Henry VIII and the Reformation Parliament transforms students into lords and commoners and members of the English parliament during the tumultuous years of 1529-1536. Cardinal Wolsey has just been dismissed as lord chancellor for failing to obtain from the pope the divorce king Henry is seeking from Catherine of Aragon, his wife of twenty years. Thomas More is named as Wolsey's replacement. More presides over a newly summoned parliament, which the king hopes will somehow find the legal means to annul his marriage to Catherine, thus allowing him to proceed with his plans to marry Anne Boleyn and have by her a male heir. But will parliament find the means, and will it be satisfied with solving the king's marital and dynastic problems? There are some in parliament who wish to use the royal divorce, as well as the rising anticlericalism in the land, to effect a split from Rome and a conversion of England from Catholicism to Protestantism. Other members oppose the divorce, oppose making the king head of the English church, and, most of all, oppose this new, heretical creed filtering in from the continent. More is their leader, for as long as he can survive. Thomas Cromwell leads the king's party. One problem is that the king is ambivalent about the reform effort unleashed by his so called "great matter," and so the conservatives are free to prosecute reformers as heretics, while the reformers are free to prosecute conservatives as traitors. Conservatives are liable to this charge because their frustration at home tempts them to consider petitioning the king of Spain and Holy Roman Emperor to invade England on behalf of Catholic Europe. The game reaches its dramatic climax around the trial of Anne Boleyn, staged as a grand contest between opposing parties, which parties actually are multiple and fluid. All roles are individualized and most are historically based. At issue is the clash of four contending ideas: medieval Catholicism, Lutheranism, Renaissance humanism, and Machiavellian statecraft. Students read works representative of all traditions.

J. Patrick Coby is professor of Government at Smith College where he teaches courses in political theory. He is author of two books: *Socrates and the Sophistic Enlightenment: A Commentary on Plato's* Protagoras, and *Machiavelli's Romans: Liberty and Greatness in the* Discourses on Livy; and of over eighty articles and reviews.

Appendix B: Instructions for Reacting Preceptors

BASIC

An important part of the appeal of Reacting is that students run most of the classes, educate themselves and each other, and have an unusually high degree of autonomy in determining how and what they will say and write.

However, some colleges and universities have found it useful for outstanding Reacting students to serve as mentors, or preceptors, for new students. The idea evolved at the suggestion of Reacting students themselves, many of whom have sought permission from their Reacting instructor to attend the NEXT year's Reacting class to see how other students manage the challenge. Instructors who allowed students to do so enlisted their help and found that they were effective mentors. Some colleges and universities have found them sufficiently useful and helpful to give them small stipends as Reacting preceptors.

Preceptors can help reassure new students who are confused by the experience, and also serve as useful helpers to new Reacting faculty. Preceptors can also provide one-on-one guidance on how to speak in class, how to overcome nervousness, how to respond to sharp criticism, how to write persuasive speeches or effective laws or compelling stories, how to deal with personality problems within teams, how to lead and be part of a team, and how to manage anger and fear.

Preceptors play major roles in all of the faculty training conferences, as faculty and administrators try to make sense of a game that was designed for ten sessions over a month and has been crammed into two days. Often faculty and administrators regard the preceptors as indispensable geniuses; they may assume that preceptors are an essential component of Reacting. This is wrong. Preceptors have proven to be very useful at the outset of Reacting, and they have sometimes been invaluable in advising and mentoring students with poor writing, speaking, and English skills. But students themselves usually report that they really did not have much need of preceptors.

"JOB DESCRIPTION"

Students who do well in Reacting are often ideal at many tasks. That is because they have excellent skills at speaking and writing, solving problems, leadership, and teamwork. The more games a student has played, the greater his or her mastery of these skills.

But the preceptors should be reminded that they are not teachers or players in the games. They should also be advised not to provide strategy guidance or to reveal what is likely to happen in a game. This injunction is not easy to follow. The preceptor's natural inclination is to be helpful and reassuring, and thus will be tempted to relieve the confusion by explaining it all. However, students insist that much of the appeal of Reacting is in working through problems themselves, and opening up the world of the game themselves. For the student who is in considerable, persistent confusion, the

preceptor may choose to provide more concrete guidance, but this should be kept to a minimum. It is better for the student to struggle.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Prior to First Game:

The preceptor should meet with the instructor before the first session of classes. The instructor will set the parameters of the preceptor's responsibilities. If at any point during the semester the preceptor encounters a situation of which she is unsure, she should seek guidance from the instructor.

The preceptor should also read carefully all of the following:

The Reacting Pedagogy Manual (this booklet)
The instructor's guide for all of the games
The game packet—again.

The preceptor should also skim through the major texts to refresh herself on their contents.

First week of first game: Group meeting with all students

During the first week of the first game, the preceptor should meet with the entire class **outside of class, if possible.** The main purpose of this meeting is to establish rapport with the students, and to offer reassurance. Because preceptors have themselves experienced Reacting, they can more persuasively and precisely identify with the concerns of new students. (Preceptors should nevertheless review, especially, the section of this manual: "When Students are Confused.") In this group context, too, preceptors will answer questions students may have felt uncomfortable posing to the instructor.

Second and Third Week: Individual meeting with each student (first paper)

During the second week, once students have received the game packet and have been assigned their individual roles, preceptors should contact all students to find who may be having problems early on. In addition to sorting out other queries, preceptors will try to guide students toward choosing a paper topic, and will brainstorm over the best mode of presentation. (See "Writing Advisory 1: On Structure"). Preceptors will also broach the issue of teamwork and class participation. (See "Teamwork" and "Teaching Speaking.") Preceptors may also wish to visit the on-line web site to see how their students' written work compares with others, and to see if there are special problems (i.e., failure to submit on time).

Fourth and Fifth Week: Individual meetings with each student (problem focus)

Preceptors now will meet with students who seem to be having trouble. If the student has received a response to her first paper (sometimes the first papers are not graded), preceptors may think it advisable to discuss it. Students, like most people, dislike criticism—from anyone; they are especially wary of criticism from other students. It is wise to emphasize what the preceptor **likes** about a paper, and to allow the instructor's criticisms to stand on their own. If the student does not understand the criticisms, or asks for another take on them, then the preceptor can and should weigh in with her views.

Preceptors should never criticize the instructor. If a student is chiefly concerned with classroom dynamics, or her relation to the team, preceptors should outline their own experiences with such matters. Reassurance, always, is helpful.

If, as a result of these discussions, preceptors learn of some substantial problem—a student who is experiencing severe adjustment crisis, or is ill, or hates her role, etc.—then they should advise the instructor to meet individually with the student.

Preparation for the Second Game

After the first game, Preceptors should read the instructor's manual for the second game as well as the game materials (and roles). Preceptors should again meet with the instructor for guidance as to which skills should be focused, and to determine if the preceptor's role requires any adjustment.

Appendix C: Introduction to Course and Writing Advisories

The subsequent pages contain an "Introduction to Course" that can be distributed to students on the first class meeting.

Following the Introduction to "Reacting to the Past" are four sample writing advisories designed for students in "Reacting" courses. The "Writing Advisories" were prepared with assistance of Ann Davison, Professor of English and Project Coordinator of the Freshman Year Initiative at Queens College, CUNY.

FOR STUDENTS:

INTRODUCTION TO "REACTING TO THE PAST"

Basic Concept

Most college seminars adopt, intentionally or not, a Socratic approach: the instructor guides students through difficult texts by posing questions. This class is different. Here students will play elaborate games, each lasting about a ten sessions and set in the past. In each game you will be assigned a role of an historical figure in the past; your role will include a description of your "game objective."

For the first few sessions of each game, the instructor provides guidance on the issues and historical context on which the game will turn. But early in the third session (or thereabouts), the class will break into factions, as students with similar roles meet together to accomplish their objectives. You will probably meet with your faction outside of class as well.

By the fourth or fifth session, the class will again meet as one. Students whose characters function in a supervisory capacity—president of the Athenian Assembly, First Grand Secretary in the Hanlin Academy of the Ming Dynasty, Governor General of the Simla Conference in India—will preside over what transpires. The instructor will intrude merely to resolve disputes or issue rulings on other matters.

The heart of the game is persuasion. For nearly every role to which you've been assigned, you must persuade others that "your" views make more sense than those of your opponents. Your views will be informed by important texts cited in your game objectives. You have two ways of expressing your views: orally and in writing. Both will be graded by the instructor.

Requirements and Grading

WRITING

Each game will have approximately two written assignments totaling about ten to twelve pages. Each paper will be graded by the instructor. Your instructor will inform you of how much of your grade is based on your written work.

You are largely free to choose whatever form of written expression you wish. The purpose of your written work is to help you achieve your goals. You may think it

advantageous to write a legal indictment, a poem, a sermon, a newspaper article, a diary entry, or whatever else serves your purpose. A common form of expression will be an essay to rebut the arguments of your opponents. For many roles, you will find it wise to coordinate your work with others whose goals are similar to your own.

Because the purpose of your written work is to persuade other students, it will be posted on the class web site on the internet, or distributed to the entire class through e-mail or perhaps by hard copy. Your instructor will advise you on how your paper is to be made available to the entire class.

Just as you will sometimes criticize the views of those whose purposes differ from your own, they will subject your written work to a sharp reading. The written work will form an important part of class discussions.

You must understand the ideas that inform your historical role; you must also persuade others that these ideas make sense. Your writing will be an exercise in persuasion. You need not believe what you argue, but you must make your case persuasively.

And you must submit your work on time. A beautifully crafted defense of Socrates does him no good if he has already sipped the hemlock. Late work harms your team as well. The requirements of the game—particularly the mechanism for posting all papers on the web site—further necessitate timely submission of written work. The instructor will likely impose a penalty for written work that is late.

CLASS PARTICIPATION

You will also seek to achieve your "game objectives" by expressing your views in the full classroom. You will sometimes speak as a member of a particular team, or faction; sometimes you will be alone; sometimes your role will be indeterminate, and you will have the freedom to write your own game objective in response to what you have read and heard. But in all roles, you must sooner or later seek to persuade others so as to achieve your objectives and win the game.

There is one constraint on your oral performance: you may refer to notes but reading aloud is unnecessary (the full and precise text of your major presentations may be posted on a website). Your class performance counts for ____% of your grade for each game, as graded by the instructor; it is nearly impossible to receive an "A" for classroom presentations that have been read aloud verbatim. Most games include a half grade bonus (B becomes B+) for those who win, that is, achieve their game objectives. Whether the game includes a bonus will be indicated by the instructor at its outset.

Unless you are "dead" or have somehow been silenced, you can participate freely in all oral discussions. Those students whose roles make them responsible for running the class may determine who speaks and when. This may prove frustrating. As a means of ensuring that everyone has an opportunity to speak, the classroom may be provided with a podium, at which anyone may stand. Anyone who approaches the podium asserts their right to give a speech, pose questions, or address the class. If someone is already at the podium, you may take a place in line behind her.

READING

The central premise of these games is that ideas influence lives and that the problems confronting particular lives influence the evolution of ideas. A less obvious corollary is that the study of ideas cannot be undertaken without consideration of the social context in which they emerged; and that the study of people requires an awareness of the intellectual constructs that have shaped their societies and cultures.

This is important to the game because you will be obliged, in a very short time, to acquire a solid understanding of complex ideas, and also to navigate through an historical situation that is equally complicated.

The readings, consequently, tend to be of two types: first, the works of important thinkers; and, second, books and articles that establish the social or historical context. You may be daunted by your first encounter with Plato's *Republic* or the *Analects of Confucius* or the sermons of Puritan ministers. These works are not easy because the ideas themselves are (literally) so thoughtful. There are good reasons why they have had so powerful an impact on civilizations. You cannot understand such texts without engaging with them fully, and in the light of the historical moment that brought them to the fore. You may be tempted to take a point that makes sense to us without bothering to figure out how the argument was originally framed. ("We all know that democracy is good, right?") This strategy almost surely will not work: the superficiality of your engagement with the material will be evident to the instructor. More important, your easy arguments, though perhaps attuned to your classmates, will be hard to defend when sharply examined by those whose roles contradict yours. Socrates/Plato has devised an ingenious worldview, with a series of powerful presuppositions; this is true of Confucius and the Puritans, too. If you have failed to engage with the entire train of their ideas, you will be hard-pressed to make persuasive arguments.

Your task as reader is simplified by the fact that your *position* is determined at the outset. That is, if you have been assigned the task of persuading the people of Athens that democracy is good, then your reading of Plato's *Republic* will be adversarial. If you are a Hindu radical, you will be inclined to criticize the literature of the Islamic nationalist, Muhammad Iqbal. You will look for weaknesses of evidence or argument.

You will also need to understand the historical context. Some students in every game will have roles that are indeterminate or ambiguous. The "indeterminates" are partially free to read the primary texts and listen to the class debates with an open mind. But heed the modifier **partially**: the roles of these students are not **determined**, but they are **shaped by history**. Their "victory objectives" oblige them to "represent" a type of actual historical person. This cannot be defined precisely: the "indeterminates" will have the freedom to arrive at their own opinions, but their opinions must in some way be consistent with their historical "role." This, too, is like life. When, for example, you are called to serve as juror, you are free to vote your opinion, yet you have also agreed, through your oath as juror, to abide by the laws of the state. "Indeterminates," though free to take whatever position they wish, are still obliged to represent with some credibility their social/historical role. (In their initial paper and remarks, the "indeterminates" may wish to request guidance from the disputants.)

To win the debates—to persuade the "indeterminates" to support your objectives—you must understand the historical/social context of their assumed lives. To further promote

historical verisimilitude, additional "roles" will be included in some games. That is, the objectives of some students may be "determined" (stated at the outset) and yet not correspond with those of the major factions. In life, some people always have their own, or merely different, agendas. The purpose of such roles is to establish additional links to the actual forces that impinged on the historical debates. A close reading of the historical context will provide clues as to these forces.

Contingency

Most history courses teach what happened. Historians deduce the causal factors—usually economic, sociological, political, and technological—that produced some consequence: for example, the Industrial Revolution of the late 18th and early 19th centuries gave rise to worker's movements; the growth of maritime commerce in ancient Athens contributed to its supremacy in naval engagements, etc. Often missing from scholarly studies is the importance of individual actions and decisions. This course presumes that individuals play a significant role in history; it asserts that broader economic and social forces place constraints on what individuals may do, but that those forces do not **determine** human events. Individual people do.

The course seeks to replicate the historical context of a particular past, with all its causal forces: economic, sociological, political, and otherwise. But it provides students with the opportunity to explore counterfactual issues of individual agency: Would a different constellation of leaders in Socratic Athens have effectively resisted the rise of Athenian democracy? Would a different set of arguments have prevented Galileo from being convicted by the Inquisition? To assert that human agency matters is to say that what actually happened need **not** have happened. Historical forces do not foreordain human affairs. History is not **predetermined**. It is contingent on multiple factors, including the vagaries of human individuality.

That is one reason why this class, though set in the past, is constructed as a game. It differs from most games in that you do not know all the rules at the outset. Things will happen that you may not anticipate and over which you have little or no control. The game will unfold in ways that are undetermined from the outset: what you do affects what will happen.

Nevertheless, not all people begin the game—or life—on equal footing. The role you are given at the outset certainly influences your prospects. Some objectives are more difficult to achieve than others; and chance intervenes in unpredictable ways. Thus you may play a game brilliantly and still not win your objectives; and you can bungle your way to success. That is true in life as well.

As in life, too, you can improve your prospects for success in several ways: by forming an effective and cooperative team; by studying the world you inhabit; by making plans for the unexpected; and by working hard to win others over to your views. You also need information, lots of it: about the historical context, and about the other players. You need to understand those whom you wish to persuade, and those who may seek to block your

goals. Read the game materials several times, and the accompanying texts carefully. And you need real skills: to speak and write clearly and persuasively; to work effectively with others; and to figure out how to solve problems.

Each game is based on the game designers' sense of the period. What happened in the past will not necessarily repeat itself in this game, but the "real" history may provide some sense of the likely issues that will emerge and of the designers' understanding of historical causation. If you study the historical context carefully, you have a better chance of understanding what will likely happen in the future. That, too, is true in life as well.

How to "React"

ROLES

In life, most people are assigned multiple roles. We "perform" as students, parents, spouses, employees, voters, etc., without being fully conscious of our goals, or, more precisely, without understanding how one role may affect our performance of another. (One example: bosses may script a role that requires our total commitment to work, and offer us abundant and tangible rewards for a good performance; yet we may sometimes reject this role because our friends or family demand a very different performance.) No one knows for certain his or her own ultimate goals; people who presume to know that information about themselves or others are mistaken.

For this reason and for some practical ones as well, students should not assume that their initial, printed "game objectives" are "permanent." Opinions change, as do objectives. The fates (or the Gamemaster) may alter students' objectives, perhaps informing them so by e-mail. Sometimes students will be enjoined to secrecy. Again, as in life, never assume that your knowledge is complete or perfect.

OTHER PLAYERS: "IN" ROLE OR "OUT" OF IT

Reacting games often acquire considerable intensity. Sometimes debates continue in dining halls and dorm rooms. Sometimes factions will meet on weekends. Sometimes roommates find themselves on different factions. Occasionally these out-of-class sessions, which are part of Reacting, produce difficulties, especially when a friend or roommate "makes a deal" with another, only to renege in class. Students should assume that, until a game is over, their peers in the game are "always" performing their game role. During a game no student should advise an indeterminate student or a player on another faction, "Trust me on this. After all, I'm your friend/roommate/etc." Such promises violate the spirit of the game; worse, they can harm your relationships with others. To clarify: students are encouraged to explore, fully and in depth, all of the issues of the games; and they are encouraged to approach and persuade others outside of class. But they should never justify game-related actions on the basis of personal ties.

INSTRUCTOR VERSUS GAMEMASTER

Your instructor for this course has two somewhat different roles. On the one hand, she will grade your oral and written work much like an instructor in your other courses. During the introductory classes for each game, moreover, she will lecture or lead discussions in the conventional manner. But the instructor is also responsible for running games and advising students on matters of strategy and rhetoric. Her main goal in running the games is to ensure, as best she can, that the game be a fulfilling and historically credible experience. Thus she cannot disclose to a member of Faction A the strategy of someone in Faction B. Nor can she reveal some of the elements of game design that were hidden from the actual historical figures. Part of the game experience is the unfolding of these elements.

Thus in running the game, the instructor will not tell you everything she knows. So that you can distinguish between when the instructor is behaving in the conventional manner and when she is acting in proprietary fashion as "Gamemaster," she may so identify herself. That is to say, if the instructor identifies herself, in class or in e-mails as "Gamemaster," she is functioning in that special role. When she identifies herself as "instructor," she is acting as a "normal" teacher.

If you are not sure which hat she is wearing, simply ask her.

DECORUM

We are taught to be polite to and considerate of others. Such behavior is good and has been praised by moral philosophers (and parents) for millennia. A genial manner is also a wise rhetorical strategy: it helps win people over to your views; sarcasm, on the other hand, is dangerous: it often alienates undecided listeners. Sometimes, however, you will be obliged to disagree with others and muster up all possible rhetorical power to refute them. If you're obliged to defend Socrates, can you smilingly let stand an argument that digs his grave?

You should also remember that what players say and do is part of their role, not an expression of their personal feelings. Remember, too, that bitter foes in one game will likely be staunch allies in the next.

LEADERSHIP AND TIME COMMITMENT

Those students who are assigned leadership roles, or who are elected to them, will generally have a heavier workload. They may organize after-class strategy sessions for their faction, cajole dilatory essayists, and take the lead in class debates. But to equalize the burden, the instructor will try to avoid having the leaders in one game repeat as leaders in subsequent games.

If you have a special activity during part of the semester that will restrict your time, you should advise the instructor before he distributes the roles. You might be given a "lighter" role for that month. Sometimes the major roles—the central figures in any

game—are not explicitly defined as leadership roles. Often students with seemingly "minor" roles emerge as the critical figures in the game—and in history.

REACTING FELLOWS/PRECEPTORS

In some Reacting classes, veteran students of Reacting have been hired to serve as "Reacting Preceptors." Each Reacting preceptor will be assigned to work with a class. Reacting preceptors are to provide suggestions and guidance: 1) on the structure and workings of each game; 2) on possible paper topics and writing strategies; 3) on approaches to oral presentation and rhetorical speaking more generally; 4) on how to make papers clearer and more persuasive; 5) on group dynamics: functioning as a leader, working within a team, coping with adversity, etc. Reacting preceptors are to help make the Reacting experience more fulfilling. Students should not hesitate to ask questions or raise problems with their Reacting preceptor, who has no function in assessment or grading. Preceptors are a resource; you are not obliged to consult with them.

Preceptors will not work with factions, become involved in the dynamics of any game, reveal anything about one student's work or plans to any other student, or proofread papers for errors.

Preceptors work under the direction of the instructor for the course. They do not supersede the instructor. Students should not hesitate to consult with the instructor, either by e-mail. Students should meet with their Instructor, or send him an e-mail query, at least once during the first two weeks of a game.

WRITING ADVISORY #1: ON PERSUASION AND STRUCTURE

Usually you write, or speak, because you have something to say. If you have nothing to say to your readers, you cannot write well. Even great writers write poorly when they are uncertain of their message. In Reacting, your victory objectives spell out your purpose, and the major texts on which you base your opinion—say, Plato's *Republic*—explain what "you" believe. Your task is to frame a particular argument and make it persuasive. If, for example, you seek to prove that Socrates is a scoundrel who should be punished, you must decide how to persuade others in the class, especially the indeterminates, to regard Socrates as "you" do.

To do this, you must first understand the issues under consideration. You may find it helpful to underline, annotate, or paraphrase key passages in the assigned readings. Then, you might ask yourself what arguments would persuade **you** that Socrates should be punished. Having sorted out the idea in your own mind, you should consider your audience. Who will hear or read your argument? If you wish to address indeterminates, find details about their historical character. (Indeterminates usually have considerable freedom to decide issues on their own, but they are obliged to reconcile their positions with their historical "persona.") Insofar as the indeterminates' opinions are thus an amalgam of their "true" selves (whatever that means) and the particular historical circumstances they are asked to inhabit, you may wish to find out more about their "real" views. When you write, keep your audience firmly in mind. What can you say that will **influence** them?

You persuade in different ways. Sometimes you employ rhetoric to appeal to your reader's emotions; sometimes you make an argument to appeal to his or her reason. Persuasion and argument can be combined to great effect. Try to be aware, however, which part of your audience—its heart or its mind—you are addressing. Consider your previous performances and those of your fellow students. Did an earlier class presentation or paper seem to "persuade" others? Ask individuals in the class, and the instructor, what worked and why.

Once you know what to say, and have a sense of your audience, you must find the best structure for your words. The essay form fits most rhetorical purposes: you cannot prevail without mastering it. But you may consider alternatives. Perhaps it makes sense to state your point as a hard-biting legal indictment: "I hereby charge Socrates with the following crimes…." Or perhaps you may opt for poetry or a short story. Do not select a genre because of its novelty: poetry can be effective in many circumstances, but probably it is ill-adapted to the task of prosecution; and fiction may not be the best way to persuade readers that real danger lurks in their ranks. Humor is nearly always welcome, but it may not inspire readers to take grave action. If you choose an unusual rhetorical form, you may wish to consult your instructor or preceptor for illustrative models.

Take a firm position and make a strong case for it with evidence. Present evidence in an orderly way. The following structure is useful for constructing an effective argument:

Introduction—Body—Conclusion

In the introduction (I), you set the mood, introduce the issues so as to draw the reader into your mind set, and state your position. Then you present your reasons, supported by

evidence, in the main body of the piece (B). In the conclusion (C), you demonstrate that the evidence leads to your stated position. In addition, you might show why the issue is important. Often the conclusion will allude to the ideas of the introduction, suggesting symmetry and promoting closure. For example:

I: Suggests why, though toleration is good, we must sometimes speak ill of people.
B1: Asserts that we must speak ill of Socrates because he corrupts the young.
B2: Asserts that we must speak ill of Socrates because he defames the gods.
C: Concludes that Socrates is a scoundrel who warrants censure.

Remember that offering specific examples or quoting from texts or renowned figures is an effective means of supporting your assertions.

This structure, rather like the sonata form in music, can lend itself to diverse rhetorical purposes. It imparts movement and direction to any argument. You will doubtless employ it, or some variant, in much of your work in college.

As you develop your draft, place an "I" in the margin next to the introduction, and a "C" next to the conclusion. (Each may have one or more paragraphs.) Place a "B" 1 through x next to the paragraphs in the body. Arrange these paragraphs in the most compelling order. If some paragraphs do not fit, or do not add convincingly to your argument, move or eliminate them.

A clear structure sharpens your message; but what if you do not want to reveal your thoughts? For example, King Louis VI has been captured in an evident effort to escape from France. As his supporter, you must cover for him to save his neck. Sly distractions and digressions in your defense may sow enough confusion to undermine the charges against the King. Politicians do this a lot, as do people mired in litigation. If you want to confuse your reader, do the opposite of these advisories.

WRITING ADVISORY #2: COHERENCE

The first advisory considered your choice of genre and structure. This advisory addresses the structure of paragraphs, and the logical sequence of paragraphs within the essay. The basic points are simple: you should check each paragraph to determine, first, whether it conveys a single idea; and second, whether all sentences within the paragraph advance that one idea. If any sentence does not advance the idea of the paragraph, you must move or delete that sentence. You must then check to ensure that the sequence of paragraphs/ideas proceeds logically.
An outline, at least in rudimentary form, serves to help you organize your ideas:

Claim: Socrates is guilty.
Paragraph 2: He promotes censorship, which is antithetical to democracy.
Paragraph 3: He invents new gods, and criticizes existing ones, which demoralizes the Athenian people.
Paragraph 4 & 5: He teaches young people to hate democracy, which promotes civil war.

Your paragraphs must not contain extraneous or unnecessary sentences. They must, however, **develop and support the central idea with evidence, reasons, examples, details, and quotations**, which can be found in the assigned readings.

WRITING ADVISORY # 3: LETHAL PREDICATES—NOT TO BE

Review Writing Advisories 1 and 2: the points are simple, and for that reason readily slip from mind. This advisory concerns the sentence itself, particularly the predicate.

We learn the grammatical structure of the sentence at an early age. "Jack and Jill went up the hill." Jack and Jill (subject) WENT (predicate). In English, the predicate engineers our grammatical logic; it literally energizes the subject.

But one verb-- "to be"—does nothing and yet functions as a predicate, thereby shifting the "action" portion of the sentence onto parts of speech less qualified for that purpose. For example: "It was up the hill that Jack and Jill went." The predicate ("was") lacks force: without actually constituting a grammatical mistake, it violates grammatical logic. The predicate—was—must shoulder the work of the sentence; and it lacks the clout to undertake this job.

All too often, we force weakling subjects like "it," "this," and "there" to do the heavy work of a sentence. For example, "There is one reason why Jack and Jill went up the hill: to fetch a pail of water."

When editing your papers, look for sentences with forms of "to be" as the predicate; if their subject is "it" or "there," the sentence probably suffers from a serious defect. This can easily be fixed: replace the dead verb with a lively one, and rearrange the sentence so that the subject initiates some real action.

Sometimes "to be" verbs are unavoidable; but usually a strong verb can take their place. (For example, re-write this sentence: "Sometimes it is hard for a writer who is dependent on 'to be' verbs to be expressive of prose which is precise and shows vitality.") (One solution appears below)

You should make lists of good verbs and consciously incorporate them into your writing. Tape the list to your computer monitor. Then, when you are stuck, look at the list.

(One solution for above: "Sometimes even good writers succumb to inactive verbs and the passive voice. We must embrace sharp, vital verbs." Note active verbs: "succumb" and "embrace".)

Whenever possible, use the **active voice**, which is more forceful than the **passive voice**. In a sentence with an active voice, the subject acts; in a sentence with a passive voice, the subject is acted upon. For example:

Active: Socrates drank the hemlock.
Passive: The hemlock was drunk by Socrates.

The passive voice may be appropriate, however, when the recipient of the action is more important than the subject who acts. For example:

After his attempted escape, King Louis was escorted back to Paris.

WRITING ADVISORY # 4: PEOPLE AND THINGS, PRONOUNS AND NOUNS

Verbs impart motion and direction to our language. Pronouns and nouns give it substance.

Referent

To whom does your pronoun refer? For example:

"The British officials arrested Gandhi and his adherents. Their behavior was appalling."

The "their" is in unclear referent, applicable either to the British officials or to Gandhi and his adherents. Most writers would spot this ambivalence. The problem of unclear referents becomes more subtle when the issues are more abstract:

"Democracy in India is unstable. Its prospects are poor." ("Its" could refer to either Democracy or India?)

You should regard all pronouns as suspect until you have proof-read them.

Things You Can See, Touch, Hear, Feel, Smell:

The mind can more easily grasp ideas that relate to the senses. Conversely, ideas expressed in abstract language slip from memory. Abstract language is not always inappropriate. In law and government and philosophy, abstract language is often essential because it is meant to be generally (or universally) applicable. For example, the following is from Rousseau's *Social Contract* (1762). Rousseau is attacking the notion that "might makes right."

"The strongest [person or party] being always in the right, the only thing that matters is to act so as to become the strongest. But what kind of right is that which perishes when force fails? If we must obey perforce, there is no need to obey because we ought."

A brilliant stylist, Rousseau understood that these abstractions ("strongest," "right," "force") do not carry much rhetorical clout. So he painted a picture:

"A robber surprises me at the edge of a wood: must I not merely surrender my purse on compulsion; but, even if I could withhold it, am I in conscience bound to give it up? For certain the pistol he holds is also a power. Let us therefore admit that force does not create right."

Now the abstractions have concrete references: "strongest" becomes a "robber"; and "force" becomes a "pistol". The abstract becomes tangible. Nearly all important writers master the ability to express abstractions in concrete ways: Plato's Republic, the Analects of Confucius, the Bible—all have become influential in part because of their mastery of this principle.

In Reacting, you will often be asked to advance abstract principles—the merits of Athenian imperialism, the superiority of antiquity in Confucianism, the tripartite concept of the self in Freudian thought, and so on. But you must employ sharp, vivid language to explain and defend such notions (and their opposites).

The Power and Pitfalls of Simile and Metaphor

In response to this challenge, writers often compare that which is known with an unfamiliar concept or idea through the use of ***simile*** *and* ***metaphor****.*

Plato's Socrates was a master of both. Perhaps his most famous simile compared the sun to an abstract principle, "the good". The sun provided light, and activated the most powerful senses, allowing people to see what actually exited; "the good" was the source of truth, which activated the mind's quest for knowledge. Another was his justification of including women among the guardians of his utopia, as when he asked: "Ought female watchdogs to perform the same guard-duties as male, and watch and hunt and so on ? Or ought they to stay home on the grounds that the bearing and rearing of their puppies incapacitates them from other duties?"

Among the many famous metaphors, Socrates makes a case for the limited use of deception among good rulers, as a "kind of medicine that should be entrusted to doctors and not to laymen."

But if writers can often make good rhetorical use of metaphorical language, there is one danger: the imaginative language of the metaphor must not be inconsistent. For example, writers must not assert their desire to "calm the fires of anger" (extinguish fires, or calm wild beasts) or to "undermine the airy suppositions" (undermine foundations, or perhaps exorcise).

So, as a general principle, try to enrich your language with similes and metaphors; but check to make sure the images are internally consistent.

On Rules for Writers: A final note

Writing rules, like rules of musical composition, usually make the writing (and the music) better. But sometimes rules inhibit creativity and must be broken.

But you must be **aware** of the rules, and why you are breaking them, if you are to do so successfully.