Further reading

Two States Under Test

What makes a political arrangement feasible, rights-protecting and implementable, and which conclusions the available evidence can sustain.

Optional reading routes for the two independent games. Start with the specified sections rather than reading every work in full. Each question asks what a source establishes, what it challenges and what remains unknown. Dates of observation, publication, judgment and proposal are kept separate.

These are editorial reading notes, not endorsements by the authors or organizations. A documented case, an attributed argument, a legal finding and a proposed institution answer different questions. Neither a single household nor a single corridor establishes the fate of an entire political solution.

Checked 27 October 2026. Source titles below are clickable. Read the specific locator and access note; no outside reading is required for core play.

Follow dated proposals and arguments

This sequence dates texts, not implementation. The Geneva annexes and A Land for All brochure are undated in the acquired versions; use them as design companions rather than assigning upload-folder dates.

- 2003: locate proposed allocations, refugee provisions and dispute machinery.
- April 2018 programme, posted May 2019: identify the common-state commitments.
- 2021: distinguish statehood, self-determination, rights and political membership.
- 2024: identify the legal baseline.
- 2026: test an argument built partly on 2015 and 2025 comparisons.
- Undated companions: examine actual institutional provisions and mark what remains unspecified.

Apply the same test to each arrangement

Keep a common ledger: people and claims included; authority; dependable passage; remedy; resources; adoption. A missing detail is an open question, not proof of impossibility.

- Define whose rights and political voice the assessment must include.
- Separate a geographical claim from political agreement and dependable access.
- Follow a proposed right through assigned authority, a dispute and the resources needed for a response.
- Use the same household, rights and implementation questions for confederative and common-state proposals.
- Check legal obligations before writing a conditional conclusion and naming the missing evidence.

Read closely; keep the limit

1. The Collapse of the Two-State Solution Is a Political Decision, Not a Geographic or Economic One

Shaul Arieli · 26 February 2026; includes 2015 and 2025 comparisons

Geographical and political argument

Pressure-test a concrete counterargument to geographical inevitability. Examine the population denominator and the steps between proximity to a line, an agreed boundary and a workable political transition.

Read here: Four-page essay; pp. 1–2 concentration/locality claims; pp. 3–4 evacuation, employment, housing and final argument.

Ask: What additional boundary, access, land and consent evidence is required to move from concentration to feasibility?

Access and limit: Free full author-hosted PDF retrieved. Treat its conclusion as attributed argument: a settler population share is not land area, sovereignty, Palestinian consent or implementation.

Open source

2. The Geneva Initiative: Draft Permanent Status Agreement

Geneva Initiative; copy hosted by Economic Cooperation Foundation · 12 October 2003

Unofficial proposed agreement

Read specified powers and rights before judging a map. The draft offers a concrete institutional arrangement for comparison, including a corridor, refugee provisions and a dispute procedure.

Read here: Article 4(6), pp. 9–10; Article 7, refugees; Article 16, p. 38. Read alongside the corridor and IVG annexes.

Ask: What must happen between proposed corridor entitlement and dependable passage?

Access and limit: Free complete 39-page PDF retrieved; assigned provisions inspected. This is a proposed agreement, not enacted law, evidence of public mandate or a record of successful implementation.

Open source

Further reading, continued

3. West Bank–Gaza Corridor, Annex 02

Geneva Initiative · Document date not established; version checked 27 October 2026

Proposed agreement annex

Separate sovereignty, administration, entry, jurisdiction and closure. The proposal specifies more than a line between territories; dependable passage still requires implementing its obligations.

Read here: Section 2, PDF p. 2; section 3, p. 3; section 6(3),(7), p. 6; section 7, p. 7.

Ask: Who may close the corridor, under which combined conditions, and who can contest a closure?

Access and limit: Free complete eight-page PDF retrieved. The closure clause combines conditions with AND; Palestinian court jurisdiction is preferential, not exclusive. The URL's 2020 folder does not establish the document's date.

Open source

4. The Implementation and Verification Group, Annex 01

Geneva Initiative · Document date not established; version checked 27 October 2026

Proposed implementation annex

Test the machinery behind a promised guarantee. Trace the designated body, decision pathway, personnel and financing instead of assuming either that no response is proposed or that an assigned duty guarantees action.

Read here: Section 5(15)(d), PDF p. 12/printed p. 68; section 7, PDF p. 19/printed p. 75; sections 1–2 and 4 on resources and organization.

Ask: Who decides, who supplies people and money, and what happens if the first response fails?

Access and limit: Free complete 24-page PDF retrieved; assigned provisions inspected. Proposed guarantees are not demonstrated capability. The URL's 2019 folder does not establish the document's date.

Open source

Further reading, continued

5. From Conflict to Reconciliation: A New Vision for Palestinian-Israeli Peace

A Land for All · Undated draft for discussion; acquired 26 October 2026 and link checked 27 October 2026

Confederative two-state proposal

Compare two sovereign states with shared institutions and distinguish citizenship from residence. The brochure also identifies mechanisms that remain to be developed; treat those admissions as research questions.

Read here: PDF p. 3 tenets; pp. 6–9 return/property/residence; pp. 12–13 security; pp. 15–16 Gaza; pp. 17–18 institutions.

Ask: How would residence, property redress and coercive power work for the same household used to test Geneva?

Access and limit: Free complete 20-page PDF acquired and parsed by direct download. Web-tool PDF retrieval failed; the official English landing page was retrieved and is the fallback. Neither brochure nor landing page establishes adoption or operational enforcement.

Open source

6. Programme for a multicultural democratic state in Palestine/Israel

One Democratic State Campaign · Programme April 2018; official posting 4 May 2019

Common-state political and constitutional proposal

Examine a common-polity proposal through its stated citizenship, collective rights, replacement institutions and property/return provisions. Assess its commitments with the same institutional questions used for a two-state proposal.

Read here: THE ODSC PROGRAM, points 1–4; distinguish these commitments from the introductory political diagnosis.

Ask: Which institution would deliver equal rights, and which adoption or enforcement steps remain unspecified?

Access and limit: Free full official programme retrieved. Its advocacy claims are attributed arguments; publication is not enactment, a population mandate or a prediction of success.

Open source

Further reading, continued

7. Rethinking Statehood in Palestine: Self-Determination and Decolonization Beyond Partition

Leila H. Farsakh, editor; chapters by distinct authors · 2021

Edited academic arguments

Ask what statehood must accomplish and whose membership, rights and self-determination must enter the assessment. Use the contents to follow a constituency or institutional question beyond the resident map.

Read here: Farsakh's Introduction, printed pp. 12–16; contents locate Baconi on Gaza, Akram on nationality, Masri on constitutions and Nassar on Palestinian citizens of Israel.

Ask: Who is missing from the resident map, and how would including them change the criteria for a workable arrangement?

Access and limit: Free complete publisher-hosted open-access book. The introduction's assigned sections and contents were inspected; the entire book is not represented as read. Chapter authors' positions are distinct, not a collective mandate.

Open source

8. Advisory opinion on the occupied Palestinian territory

International Court of Justice · 19 July 2024

Advisory legal opinion

Identify legal obligations separately from a proposal's feasibility or expected enforcement.

Read here: A/78/968; paragraphs 78–83, 102, 155, 261–264, 285.

Ask: Which obligations constrain proposals, and which implementation questions remain open?

Access and limit: Free official UN PDF retrieved. Read its scope; this is neither an individual criminal verdict nor an enforcement forecast.

Open source