DRONE FRONT

EVIDENCE SEMINAR

The Southern Front

Model assumptions, causal explanations and civilian context

Content and participation

For adults and university beginners. No prior historical, source-analysis or technical knowledge is required.

These lessons discuss historical conflict, displacement, missing people, surrender and civilian-harm documentation without graphic descriptions or images. No personal disclosure is required. Linked articles may contain graphic material and are not assigned readings.

Use the equivalent text and metadata cards at any time. They retain the evidence needed for the same questions and marks while omitting images, personal narratives and numerical casualty values. Choosing this route carries no penalty.

Learning objectives

Evaluate a technology-only causal claim through competing explanations and evidence requirements.
Distinguish model assumptions from historical evidence.
Connect a bounded chronology to civilian experience without treating an evacuation assumption as fact.

Before you begin

Claim

A statement that can be examined using evidence; it is not automatically an established fact.

Source

A record, person or publication from which information comes. Repeated publication may share one origin.

Evidence

Information relevant to assessing a particular claim, with its origin and limits made explicit.

Attribution

Identifying who made a statement or supplied a record, without treating that identification as verification.

Corroboration

Relevant additional evidence that supports a claim. Repetition of one account does not supply an independent observation.

Uncertainty

What the available evidence leaves unresolved; preserve it rather than replacing it with a definite claim.

Scope

The people, places, dates and measurement categories that a record covers.

Model assumption

A setting or rule used by a simulation; it does not by itself establish what happened historically.

Suggested session plans

The 45-, 60- and 90-minute plans are untested classroom estimates, not measured play times. Educator testing and observed timing are needed before claiming classroom validation. Activities need not be timed.

45 minutes · Core evidence lesson

- 5 minutes · Orientation and glossary
- 10 minutes · Guided reading
- 10 minutes · Evidence comparison
- 15 minutes · Written assessment
- 5 minutes · Debrief

60 minutes · Core lesson with discussion

- 5 minutes · Orientation and glossary
- 10 minutes · Guided reading
- 10 minutes · Evidence comparison
- 15 minutes · Written assessment
- 15 minutes · Discussion
- 5 minutes · Debrief

90 minutes · Intermediate source-chain audit

- 5 minutes · Orientation and glossary
- 10 minutes · Guided reading
- 10 minutes · Evidence comparison
- 15 minutes · Written assessment
- 15 minutes · Discussion
- 30 minutes · Audit the source chain
- 5 minutes · Debrief

Assigned evidence cards

K1 SYNTHETIC TEACHING FIXTURE

Synthetic teaching fixture: Town A

A teaching model marks 'Town A: evacuated' but supplies no historical population record. This is a teaching fixture, not a verified app setting or historical quotation.

K2 BOUNDED SOURCE PARAPHRASE

Event period and later investigation

Amnesty's report, published 14 January 2021, investigates September–November 2020 events through later fieldwork and describes civilian displacement. Its interviews and selected cases do not establish the population of every town on every date. This is a bounded paraphrase; no injury or weapon-effect narrative is assigned.

> Equivalent metadata reading
> Publication: 14 January 2021. Stated event period: September–November 2020. The report uses later fieldwork, interviews and selected cases. These fields do not establish the population of every town on every date. No personal narrative is required.

Source references: amnesty

K3 SYNTHETIC TEACHING FIXTURE

Synthetic teaching fixture: dependent reports

Report A presents an interview. Report B repeats A's interview without new observation. Report C reports a separately conducted interview with another identified witness. These reports are a teaching source-dependence fixture, not invented historical publications. Independence must be assessed for the particular claim, including possible shared inputs.

Five short-answer questions

Two marks per question · 10 marks total
Write your answers on paper or in your own document. Use the assigned cards; no timed task or external reading is required.

Does K1's evacuated-town setting establish Town A's historical population? Explain.

Facilitator key
It is a model assumption, not a population observation; a dated, place-specific historical record would be needed.

1 mark: Identify the model assumption.
1 mark: Identify the missing historical evidence.

What evidence would you need to evaluate the claim that drones alone explain this campaign's outcome?

Facilitator key
Define the outcome and period; examine evidence for the technology claim and plausible political, institutional or social alternatives, including evidence that could challenge each account. The assigned cards alone cannot establish causal weight.

1 mark: Give a relevant evidence plan testing the claim against at least one plausible alternative.
1 mark: State an evidential limit or possible disconfirming finding.

Why can K2's 2021 publication be relevant to this 2020 lesson?

Facilitator key
Its stated event period precedes publication; later investigation can address earlier events, with retrospective limits explicit.

1 mark: Distinguish publication from event period.
1 mark: Explain relevance without treating the dates as interchangeable.

For K3's particular interview claim, which repetition adds no new observation, and what would you check before treating C as independent?

Facilitator key
B repeats A; check C's interview origin, witness and any shared information relevant to the claim.

1 mark: Identify B's dependence on A.
1 mark: Give a concrete independence check.

Evaluate this supplied contested claim in two sentences: 'Town A was empty on the historical date because the simulation marks it evacuated.' Use K1 and state what K2 can or cannot add.

Facilitator key
K1's setting cannot establish the historical population. K2 provides regional civilian context, but the supplied material neither verifies nor disproves that particular town/date claim.

1 mark: Give a bounded conclusion tied to K1.

1 mark: Identify K2's place/date limitation or the need for a matching population record.

Marking guidance

Each question has two independent one-mark points: award 0, 1 or 2 according to the points met. A bare yes/no earns no marks when reasons or evidence are requested. Accept defensible alternatives grounded in the cards; do not reward agreement with a preferred interpretation. Five questions give 10 marks per lesson and 40 questions give 80 overall. The proposed 8/10 exit threshold is an untested pilot hypothesis. The alternative cards use identical marking points.

Facilitator notes

The Q5 proposition is supplied for analysis, not attributed to a historical actor. Credit reasoned causal alternatives without requiring a predetermined conclusion. Regional context cannot verify a particular evacuation. Use the equivalent metadata route with identical marks.

Facilitator source notes

Passage review recorded: 11 October 2026

amnesty · Amnesty: In the line of fire

(https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/EUR5535022021ENGLISH.pdf)

Passage locator: Published 14 January 2021; printed p. 5, Executive Summary opening and field-investigation paragraphs; p. 6, Background final paragraph; p. 7, footnote 7.

Source limit: Assign only the bounded paraphrase and metadata. Interviews and selected cases do not establish every town's population on every date. Do not assign accounts of injuries or weapon effects.

Atrocity notice

Human Rights Watch documented unlawful attacks on populated areas by Armenian forces and apparently indiscriminate attacks by Azerbaijani forces during the 2020 war. These reports concern civilian protection across the conflict, not proof from this simulation of any particular crime.

These reports describe the wider conflict. They do not establish that every crime occurred in this modeled battle.

Studying or commanding a side does not endorse its conduct. Drone Front never lets players target civilians, hospitals, schools or places of worship. Civilian harm from simulated strikes is counted and shown in the debrief, including nonzero harm. Civilian massacres are never playable operations. Designated terrorist forces and Wagner remain computer controlled; Gaza war events remain excluded from play.

2020-12-11 · Human Rights Watch: Azerbaijan, unlawful strikes in Nagorno-Karabakh

2020-12-11 · Human Rights Watch: Armenia, unlawful rocket and missile strikes on Azerbaijan