

Instructor guide

Test the connection. Find what could stop it and who could enforce the promise.

American introductory college learners, including students encountering Israel–Palestine for the first time. Suitable for political science, sociology, geography, history and related courses.

No prior reading or prior conflict knowledge is required for core play. Begin with Starting position and the regional locator. Included source cards, definitions and assessment aids supply the core information; original articles and PDFs are opportunities to verify and extend it.

Learning objectives

• Distinguish territorial connections, assigned governing powers, rights and authorization, and practical implementation.

• Predict and explain a conditional outcome after changing one explicit input while holding other inputs fixed.

• Compare published institutional proposals using the same criterion and defend a finding with evidence and a consequential limit.

Release 3.1 · 26 October 2026 · Created by Yoav Duman

Play, downloads and web guide

Follow the investigation

All eight encounters can be revisited from Investigation map. The numbered route gives novices a coherent introduction.

Lead	Next action
1. A connection on paper	Run the connection
2. Who is inside the picture?	Trace a claim
3. What do the dots establish?	Change the evidence layer
4. Try to interrupt the promise	Compare access profiles → test the closure and response duty → predict and explain one changed condition → save a response.
5. What changed when settlers left?	Inspect a dated change
6. Keep ordinary work possible	Follow a service dependency
7. Same demand, different institutions	Choose one criterion and rerun
8. Leave with a defensible finding	Review the findings

How the revised investigation works

The revised interface distinguishes navigation from saving a finding. Each encounter supplies a task and a product, with a semantic Show this step control. The pressure lab separates the benchmark, closure scenario, one-condition experiment and response into four revisitable panels. The source allocation and proposed response duty must be revealed before the pressure-lab finding is saved; unknown capacity inputs and justified uncertainty remain valid. Model functions and the original class reflection requirement are preserved. The board defaults to findings and retains the full audit trail. Five AI simulated student perspectives reviewed all eight encounters and retested the revision; this is not an observed student study.

The short reflection

In about 50 words: what is your strongest finding about the arrangement? Name the evidence and one unresolved condition that matters.

About 50 words is enough. The exact length is not graded by the game. Instructors should look for a scoped finding, an identifiable record, a reason the record supports the finding and one important limit.

Plan the class

All timings below are author estimates and planning allocations, not measured student completion times. The eight encounters have a nominal 60-minute authoring budget. Source reading, discussion, help, accessibility needs and reflection may extend the session. Preserve incomplete work rather than rush or treat it as failure.

60-minute class: focused proposal test

A selected route, not an eight-encounter completion. Remaining leads may be assigned separately.

Time	Activity
5 min	Introduce the fictional crew, real proposals and the distinction between assumptions and observations.
35 min	Investigate encounters 1 and 4: acquire the entry rule, compare the dated practice profiles and complete one prediction–test–revision experiment.
10 min	Debrief which output changed, why others stayed separate and what could establish implementation.
10 min	Write the short reflection, save progress and export a report that clearly remains partial.

75-minute class: full-route target with debrief

Target the core route without requiring speed. Preserve a draft and continue later if needed.

Time	Activity
5 min	Explain the four kinds of feasibility question and show how to open the included evidence.
55 min	Work through the eight encounters. Protect time for initial predictions, a reasoned comparison and encounter 7’s source application; save at the midpoint.
10 min	Compare one supported provision with one remaining implementation or authorization gap.
5 min	Finish the approximately 50-word reflection and export the report or preserve an incomplete record.

Modes, records and recovery

Just for learning

Uses the same scenes, evidence, tools and factual checks. The short reflection is optional when keeping work. Learners can inspect, pause, revisit, export an incomplete record and follow deeper routes.

For class

Adds course/submission fields and a class-report workflow. Preparing the class report asks for a nonempty reflection. A name or submission ID is required only if the assignment-requires-identifier setting is selected. About 50 words is guidance, not an exact count. The report can remain explicitly incomplete; nothing is submitted automatically.

My work → Reflection

Writing saves on the current device when browser storage is available. Sources can stay pinned beside the reflection. Optional private notes are included in an export.

My work → Case record

Use Download readable report for a TXT report, Print / save PDF for the browser print dialogue, or Save progress file for a JSON recovery file. The report retains original choices, revisions, completion status, source references and the reflection.

My work → Save and recover

Use Save progress file before leaving or changing devices. Resume from a file accepts the same case’s JSON save or its marked progress-text recovery copy. Copy progress text is the fallback when downloads are blocked. A readable TXT report is not a resumable save.

Evidence board

The board first shows saved findings. Show all steps opens intermediate records; no earlier work is deleted. An optional working explanation saves as typed. Keep an explanation snapshot preserves a deliberate version with its evidence groups.

Changed conditions

A later material change can mark a kept finding for recheck. Earlier work remains in the record. Revisit the relevant test and keep a revised finding rather than restarting the game.

Course submission

Give students an accessible course link or the Complete offline ZIP, a deadline and a submission destination. Request the readable report or PDF. A progress JSON is optional supporting work, not the primary graded submission. The game has no instructor dashboard or automatic LMS upload.

Assess an explanation

Optional four-criterion rubric, 0–2 per criterion. Adapt weights to the course. Judge the student's explanation and evidence use; eight completed encounters, attached source IDs and correct supplied choices alone do not demonstrate independent understanding. A justified unresolved or negative finding can earn full credit.

Source fit

0 points. No identifiable relevant source, or a claim contradicts its date, category or scope.

1 points. Names a relevant source, but its date, scope or connection to the claim is vague.

2 points. Uses a specific relevant record and respects its date, category, case and evidence type.

Mechanism and comparison

0 points. Treats a label, map or result as an explanation without identifying the relationship.

1 points. Names an actor, condition or comparison, but explains only part of how it bears on the outcome.

2 points. Explains the relevant authority or causal link and keeps the important comparison conditions visible.

Scope and uncertainty

0 points. Makes an unsupported universal claim or treats unknown as proved failure or impossibility.

1 points. Acknowledges a limit, but leaves it generic or confuses observation with a test assumption.

2 points. Separates observed history, proposed rule and assumed condition; names a specific consequential limit.

Pressure test and revision

0 points. Ignores relevant counterevidence or gives no reason for retaining or changing a claim.

1 points. Notes a challenge or revision without explaining its significance.

2 points. Explains how a credible counterexample or changed condition affects the finding, or why the scoped claim survives it.

Debrief

• When a physical obstruction changes but the closure rule stays fixed, which result should change? What does the unchanged legal result fail to guarantee?

• How does the claim of geographical concentration differ from an agreed border or a transfer of governing powers? What evidence would each require?

• Using passage, property or voice, identify one actual difference between Geneva and ALFA or ODSC. Why does that contrast not itself establish adoption, a public mandate or compliance?

Make the work accessible

Options offers Larger text, Reduce animation and labels/list controls beside maps. Every consequential action has a button or list alternative; no precise dragging, audio or speed score is required. Tap, hover or keyboard-focus an underlined term for its definition. How to assess it and Need a lead? open included facts, an evaluation method, a limit and a next-evidence question.

Optional accounts of death are non-graphic and may be skipped. Offer a pause, extra time or the source-based alternative. Assess the reasoning, not distress, emotional intensity, identity or a learner's political position.

Source-based alternative

• Print or provide accessible copies of the assignment, glossary and the two or three source cards named for the chosen route. Do not require the entire source companion to be printed.

• Give the same practical question used in the game. Have the learner record: claim; dated source; why the evidence bears on the claim; an important limit or counterexample.

• Use the game-specific comparison suggested below, then the same approximately 50-word reflection and reasoning rubric. Identify the work as a source-based alternative, not a completed interactive run.

Use the corridor and international-guarantee cards to distinguish entry authority, closure conditions and response capacity. Compare one hypothetical change with the original conditions, then apply the same passage/property/voice question to Geneva and one contrasting proposal. Label stipulated inputs separately from facts about actual operation.

Common misreadings

A coherent corridor rule proves the two-state solution feasible, or one failed test proves every arrangement impossible. State the tested provision and conditions; separate a narrow result from spatial, rights, authorization and implementation questions.

Unknown means failure or impossibility. Name the fact the packet does not establish and the observation that could change the finding.

A settler population share is a share of land or an agreed border. Check the denominator, distance, dates and treatment of East Jerusalem before extending the claim.

A published commitment or assumed staff and funds establishes consent and actual delivery. Compare the exact institutional provision, then keep authorization, operating capacity and observed compliance separate.

Next means I saved the answer. Next only navigates. A scene's Save button records the finding; an open finding stays marked.

Assignment and extension

After the Line: test a promise

Open After the Line and choose For class. Complete the eight core encounters unless your instructor assigns a named shorter route. Preserve your pressure-lab prediction, the compared result and your reason for keeping or revising it. In the proposal comparison, identify a supported contrast or a specific remaining gap. Keep one Evidence board explanation snapshot. In My work, answer the game's prompt in about 50 words, naming evidence and an unresolved condition.

Save a progress file, then submit the readable TXT report or a PDF made with Print / save PDF through the stated course destination. Include an identifier only if required. Identify partial routes honestly; political agreement, emotional reaction and exact word length are not the assessment criteria.

About 50 words

In about 50 words: what is your strongest finding about the arrangement? Name the evidence and one unresolved condition that matters.

Two investigations, one reasoning question

Complete Under the Map and After the Line as two independent investigations, using For class if assigned. Keep a readable report and approximately 50-word reflection for each. In a joint debrief or a separate short course response, compare one implemented historical change with one proposed institutional promise. Identify the actor, the governing instrument, the relevant evidence and a limit in each. Explain one point where the same analytical distinction transfers and one point where the cases require different evidence.

Students may work in pairs to discuss the same question while maintaining individual browser records and reflections. There is no shared live session or multiplayer synchronization.

Short source-based visit

Acquire the proposed entry rule, then test a named stress and one changed assumption. Keep the initial prediction, compared result and reasoning. Reflect on what this narrow test establishes and what remains open. Export a partial report; do not present this route as a general feasibility verdict.

Independent full investigation

Follow the eight encounters to connect the proposal, rights, geography, pressure test, historical reversal, service dependencies and comparison. In the pressure lab, record predictions before the A/B result. In encounter 7, keep a supported institutional contrast or a specific remaining gap. Save at the midpoint and close with the short reflection.

Review and timing

Specialist AI review and software checks do not establish human learning effects. All session times and the planned shared content are author estimates.

Further reading and source locators