



CBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20231108_Burnt-out cars a haunting remnant of the Hamas attacks

Broadcast: MEDIA ANALYSIS REPORT | Analyzed: 2026-05-06 08:24

Version 2.0-cbc | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l)

OVERALL SCORE

6.4/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	NDP	GPC	LPC	BQ	CPC	PPC
CHES	2.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	7.5	9.0
Spectrum	Left	Left	Center	Center	Right	Right

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.9 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 **5** 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — chesdata.eu | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.

BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Information

Broadcast Title: "Burnt-out cars a haunting remnant of the Hamas attacks"

Network: CBC Television — The National

Estimated Broadcast Date: November 8, 2023 (approximately one month after October 7, 2023)

Approximate Length: 3–4 minutes (field report segment)

President: Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Anchor/Presenter: Not identifiable from transcript; appears to be a field reporter narrating on location

Location: A vehicle impound/collection lot in Israel, approximately 5 km from Gaza

Interviewees and Affiliations

Name	Affiliation/Role	Perspective Offered
Heim (surname unclear)	ZAKA volunteer — body recovery organization	Trauma of collecting remains; grief over child victims
Ot Masin	ZAKA volunteer — body recovery	Identification of remains; personal trauma
Itar Jari (phonetic)	Survivor — Nova Music Festival	Personal loss; survivor's guilt; support for Israeli military action
Hila Elie Mik	Friend of festival survivor	Emotional shock; solidarity with victims
No Nino (phonetic)	Friend of festival survivor	Emotional shock

Main Topic

A field report documenting a lot of burned-out vehicles collected from the October 7, 2023 Hamas attacks — particularly from the Nova Music Festival massacre — featuring testimony from ZAKA volunteers and survivors, filmed approximately one month after the attacks.

Current Context (State of Public Debate)

At the time of broadcast (early November 2023), Israel had launched a major ground offensive into Gaza following the October 7 Hamas attacks, which killed approximately 1,200 Israelis and resulted in approximately 240 hostages being taken. The Gaza Ministry of Health (Hamas-administered) was reporting Palestinian civilian death tolls exceeding 10,000, a figure that was already generating significant international debate about proportionality and civilian protection under international humanitarian law. Simultaneously, there was intense global debate about media coverage itself — with critics arguing that Western media was over-humanizing Israeli victims while under-humanizing Palestinian victims, and counter-critics arguing that the scale and nature of the October 7 attacks warranted sustained documentation. The International Court of Justice had not yet issued its provisional measures ruling (that came in January 2024), but legal scholars were already publicly debating whether Israel's military campaign met the threshold for violations of international humanitarian law. Within Canada specifically, the Israel-Palestine conflict had become a significant domestic political flashpoint, with the NDP calling for a ceasefire, the Liberal government initially resisting that language, and pro-Palestinian and pro-Israeli communities staging large competing demonstrations in major Canadian cities.



CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who is invited to provide authoritative perspective, and what are their funding sources, conflicts of interest, and credibility?

Finding 1:

- Organization: ZAKA
- Quote: "OT masin is with zaka a volunteer organization charged with collecting the remains of the Dead"
- Assessment: ZAKA is a legitimate Israeli Orthodox Jewish volunteer organization. However, it is not a neutral party — it operates within Israeli society, is funded by Israeli donors and government grants, and has an institutional interest in documenting Israeli casualties. It has no mandate to document Palestinian casualties.
- Why problematic: ZAKA is presented as a factual/forensic authority ("charged with collecting the remains") without disclosure of its institutional context. Viewers may interpret its representatives as neutral experts rather than as members of an Israeli civil society organization with a specific mandate.

Finding 2:

- Interviewees: All five named interviewees are Israeli civilians or Israeli civil society workers
- Quote: Multiple — entire interview roster
- Technique: Homogeneous source selection. Every person given a voice in this segment shares the same national, cultural, and experiential perspective.
- Why problematic: CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices explicitly require that coverage of controversial topics include a diversity of perspectives. A segment filmed during an active military conflict that kills civilians on both sides, featuring exclusively one side's civilian voices, fails this standard.

Finding 3:

- Missing experts: No international law expert, no conflict historian, no mental health professional, no UN official
- Quote: N/A — absence is the finding
- Technique: Expert vacuum filled by emotional testimony. The absence of any analytical or contextualizing expert means the segment functions as pure emotional testimony without interpretive framework.
- Why problematic: Emotional testimony is powerful and legitimate journalism. But without expert contextualization, it becomes advocacy. The absence of any expert who could place these events in a broader framework is a significant editorial choice.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Definition: Diversity and independence of cited sources, including funding, mandate, and potential conflicts of interest.

Finding 1:

- Source: ZAKA
- Funding: Israeli government grants, private Israeli and diaspora Jewish donors, international Jewish philanthropic organizations
- Conflict of interest: ZAKA operates exclusively within Israeli society and has an institutional mandate focused on Israeli Jewish victims
- Counter-voice offered: No
- Assessment: ZAKA is a credible organization for its stated purpose but is not a neutral source on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Its presentation as a neutral forensic authority without disclosure of its institutional context is misleading.

Finding 2:

- Sources overall: All sources are Israeli civilians or Israeli civil society workers. No international sources, no Palestinian sources, no independent observers.
- Assessment: The source selection is entirely homogeneous. This would be appropriate for a segment explicitly framed as "voices from the Israeli side" but is problematic for a segment presented as journalism about the conflict.

Finding 3:

- Absent sources: No reference to UN reports, human rights organization assessments, or international media reporting on conditions in Gaza.
- Why problematic: At the time of broadcast, multiple credible international organizations had issued statements and reports on the conflict. Their complete absence from the segment represents a significant source selection failure.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: The balance of speaking time between different positions, perspectives, or parties.

Time Distribution Analysis:

Speaker/Perspective	Approximate Speaking Time	% of Total
Israeli civilian survivors	~60 seconds	~35%
ZAKA volunteers	~45 seconds	~26%
Reporter narration (pro-Israeli framing)	~60 seconds	~35%
Palestinian perspective	0 seconds	0%
Neutral expert/analyst	0 seconds	0%
Israeli government/military	0 seconds	0%
International context	0 seconds	0%

Finding 1: 100% of interview time is allocated to Israeli civilians and Israeli civil society workers. Zero time is allocated to any Palestinian voice, any neutral expert, or any contextualizing perspective.

Finding 2: The reporter's narration, which constitutes approximately 35% of the segment, is consistently framed in sympathy with the Israeli perspective, effectively functioning as additional pro-Israeli content rather than neutral bridging material.

Finding 3: The only reference to the Palestinian/Gaza dimension is a brief observational note about artillery fire, which is framed as a consequence of Hamas's actions rather than as an independent subject of journalistic inquiry.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What relevant facts, perspectives, or context are absent from the broadcast?

Finding 1:

- Location: Throughout — structural omission
- Omitted fact: At the time of broadcast, Israeli military operations in Gaza had killed an estimated 10,000+ Palestinian civilians, including thousands of children, according to Gaza health authorities.
- Why problematic: A broadcast that documents Israeli civilian suffering during an active military campaign, without any reference to the simultaneous and ongoing Palestinian civilian death toll, presents a radically incomplete picture of the conflict. This is not a minor omission — it is the central omission that defines the segment's one-sidedness.

Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "smoke hangs over Gaza just about 5 km away from here outgoing artillery fire booms"
- Omitted context: The reporter observes artillery fire into Gaza but makes no attempt to report on what that artillery fire is hitting, who is being killed, or what conditions are like in Gaza.
- Why problematic: The reporter is physically close enough to observe the bombardment of Gaza but chooses not to report on it. This is an active editorial decision to exclude the Palestinian dimension of the story from a segment that is ostensibly about the consequences of the conflict.

Finding 3:

- Location: Interviewee statement, unchallenged
- Quote: "we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore"
- Omitted response: This statement — which could be interpreted as expressing a desire for the elimination of Gaza as a territory or population — is not followed by any journalistic challenge, contextualization, or counterpoint.
- Why problematic: CBC's standards require that reporters challenge statements that may be factually problematic or ethically extreme. A statement expressing a desire for Gaza to cease to exist, made during an active military campaign, requires journalistic engagement. Its unchallenged inclusion normalizes an extreme position.

Missing Voices

1. Palestinian civilians in Gaza — experiencing simultaneous bombardment at the time of broadcast
2. International humanitarian law scholars — to contextualize the legal status of the attacks and the military response
3. Israeli peace movement representatives — Israelis who oppose the military campaign or advocate for negotiated solutions
4. UN officials or UNRWA representatives — documenting conditions in Gaza
5. Hostage negotiation experts or families of hostages — a central dimension of the crisis
6. Arab-Israeli citizens — a significant population with a distinct perspective
7. Journalists or human rights monitors — documenting conditions on both sides
8. Canadian government officials — to provide the Canadian policy dimension relevant to a CBC broadcast



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, proportion (%) and trend

Definition: Selective, misleading, or decontextualized use of numbers and statistics.

Finding 1:

- Location: Mid-segment
- Quote: "near Oz almost half of its residents killed or taken hostage"
- Assessment: This statistic is presented without a source citation. The figure is broadly consistent with reporting on Kibbutz Be'eri and similar communities, but "almost half" is a significant claim that requires sourcing.
- Why problematic: Unsourced statistics in a conflict context, even if directionally accurate, fail basic journalistic standards of verification and attribution.

Finding 2:

- Location: Opening
- Quote: "hundreds of cars destroyed in the Hamas attacks"
- Assessment: "Hundreds" is vague. The actual number of vehicles at the lot was reported by various outlets as approximately 700–1,000. The vagueness is not necessarily manipulative but represents an opportunity for precision that was not taken.

Finding 3:

- Structural omission: No statistics about Palestinian casualties are provided, despite the reporter being 5 km from Gaza during an active bombardment that had already killed thousands.
- Why problematic: The selective presentation of casualty statistics — Israeli deaths documented in detail, Palestinian deaths entirely absent — creates a numerically distorted picture of the conflict's human cost.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting positions by associating them with extremes, without direct evidence.

Finding 1:

- Location: Description of Hamas vehicles
- Quote: "these trucks that were used by Hamas during the attacks they're kept as far away from the others as possible at the far end of the dirt field"
- Technique: Physical separation as moral contamination. The reporter notes that Hamas vehicles are kept "as far away from the others as possible," lending journalistic legitimacy to a symbolic act of moral separation. This reinforces the dehumanization of Hamas without analytical engagement.
- Why problematic: While the physical arrangement of the lot is a factual observation, the reporter's choice to note and emphasize it — without comment — implicitly endorses the symbolic logic of contamination.

Finding 2:

- Location: Throughout
- Technique: Hamas is consistently associated with maximum brutality ("severed heads," "severed fingers," "killed everyone they saw") while no equivalent moral characterization is applied to Israeli military operations.
- Why problematic: The asymmetric application of moral characterization — brutality attributed to Hamas, neutrality attributed to Israeli military action — is a form of implicit guilt-by-association that frames one side as inherently barbaric.



7. TIMING & PLACEMENT

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Strategic positioning of information within the broadcast and within the broader news cycle.

Finding 1:

- Context: The segment was broadcast approximately one month after October 7, coinciding with the peak of Israel's ground offensive in Gaza.
- Assessment: Broadcasting a segment focused exclusively on Israeli suffering at the precise moment when Palestinian civilian casualties were reaching their highest point in the conflict represents a significant editorial timing choice.
- Why problematic: The timing creates an implicit editorial message: Israeli suffering is the story, even as Palestinian suffering reaches its peak. This is not necessarily intentional manipulation, but it is a consequential editorial decision that required more explicit justification.

Finding 2:

- Structure: The segment opens with the most viscerally disturbing imagery (smell of death, burned cars) and closes with the most emotionally resonant image (balloon at a car seat for a missing child). This is a classic emotional arc structure.
- Why problematic: The deliberate emotional architecture of the segment — from horror to grief to fragile hope — is a narrative technique more associated with advocacy filmmaking than with balanced journalism.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

Definition: Moral outrage expressed at certain positions or actors but not at equivalent actions by others.

Finding 1:

- Quote: "some lit on fire investigators say with their passengers still inside"
- Assessment: This detail — burning people alive in cars — is presented with appropriate moral weight. It is a genuine atrocity that warrants documentation.
- Asymmetry: No equivalent moral weight is given to Israeli military actions in Gaza, which at the time of broadcast included strikes on hospitals, refugee camps, and civilian infrastructure, documented by multiple international organizations.
- Why problematic: Selective moral outrage — horror at Hamas atrocities, silence on Israeli military conduct — is not journalism. It is advocacy.

Finding 2:

- Quote: "we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore" — unchallenged
- Assessment: A statement expressing a desire for the elimination of Gaza is allowed to stand without any journalistic response. If a Palestinian interviewee had expressed an equivalent desire regarding Israel, it is reasonable to assume the reporter would have responded differently.
- Why problematic: The asymmetric treatment of extreme statements — challenging them when made by one side, ignoring them when made by the other — is a textbook example of selective outrage.

Finding 3:

- Quote: "you know it feel like an Holocaust modern Holocaust"
- Assessment: The Holocaust comparison is allowed to stand unchallenged. This is an extraordinarily charged historical claim. Its unchallenged inclusion represents an implicit editorial endorsement.
- Why problematic: Responsible journalism requires that historically charged comparisons be contextualized, not simply amplified.



9. COMPLETENESS								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Share of covered perspectives

Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).

- | # | Perspective | Status |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Israeli civilian victims and survivors of October 7 | COVERED — Multiple interviewees |
| 2 | Israeli forensic/humanitarian workers (ZAKA) | COVERED — Two interviewees |
| 3 | Palestinian civilian perspective on the ongoing bombardment of Gaza | OMITTED |
| 4 | International humanitarian law experts on the conflict | OMITTED |
| 5 | Hamas political/military rationale or stated objectives (even via statement) | OMITTED |
| 6 | Israeli government/military official perspective | OMITTED (implied through framing) |
| 7 | Human rights organizations (Amnesty, HRW, B'Tselem, etc.) | OMITTED |
| 8 | Hostage families' perspective | MENTIONED (briefly, indirectly) |
| 9 | Mental health/trauma specialists on mass casualty events | OMITTED |
| 10 | Historical/political context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict | OMITTED |

Completeness Score: 2/10



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How the topic is fundamentally constructed — what assumptions are built into the story's premise, what is treated as given, and what narrative arc is established.

Finding 1:

- Location: Opening narration
- Quote: "the burned out remnants of hundreds of cars destroyed in the Hamas attacks of October 7th"
- Technique: Exclusive victimhood framing. The entire segment is framed as a memorial/witness report to Israeli suffering. The frame is established immediately and never challenged or complicated.
- Why problematic: A balanced broadcast on this topic — filmed during an active military campaign killing thousands of Palestinian civilians — would at minimum acknowledge the dual nature of the ongoing crisis. The framing treats October 7 as the totality of the story, not as one dimension of a complex, ongoing conflict.

Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment narration
- Quote: "smoke hangs over Gaza just about 5 km away from here outgoing artillery fire booms reminders of the war and Untold suffering triggered by this attack"
- Technique: Causal attribution framing. The phrase "triggered by this attack" frames all subsequent suffering — including Palestinian civilian deaths — as caused by Hamas, removing Israeli military decision-making from the causal chain.
- Why problematic: This framing is editorially loaded. Israel's military response was a sovereign decision; describing Palestinian suffering as merely "triggered" by Hamas erases Israeli agency and responsibility for the conduct of the military campaign, which was the subject of intense international legal and ethical debate at the time.

Finding 3:

- Location: Closing narration
- Quote: "even as hope here can be hard to hang on to"
- Technique: Emotional closure framing. The segment ends on a note of Israeli grief and hope, with the balloon at the car seat as a visual/emotional anchor. This frames the entire conflict through the lens of Israeli loss with no corresponding acknowledgment of Palestinian loss.
- Why problematic: At the time of broadcast, Gaza's death toll was already in the thousands. A closing frame that positions hope exclusively within the Israeli experience implicitly denies equivalent humanity to the other side of the conflict.



11. WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: The use of loaded language, connotations, euphemisms, or dysphemisms that systematically favor one side.

Finding 1:

- Location: Opening narration
- Quote: "the smell of death hangs in the air"
- Technique: Sensory/visceral language. Highly evocative, emotionally activating language is used exclusively to describe the Israeli site. No equivalent sensory language is used to describe conditions in Gaza.
- Why problematic: Sensory language creates empathic identification. Its exclusive application to one side of a conflict creates asymmetric emotional engagement in the viewer, which is a recognized technique in advocacy journalism.

Finding 2:

- Location: Mid-segment, describing Hamas fighters
- Quote: "Hamas militants storming the festival grounds killing hundreds of young people abducting many others"
- Technique: Dysphemistic labeling ("militants," "storming") applied consistently to Hamas actors, while no equivalent critical language is applied to Israeli military operations visible in the background (artillery fire into Gaza).
- Why problematic: While "militants" is a defensible descriptor, the asymmetry is the issue: the same broadcast describes Israeli artillery fire neutrally ("outgoing artillery fire booms") without characterizing the actors or their actions with equivalent moral weight.

Finding 3:

- Location: Interviewee quote, not challenged by reporter
- Quote: "you know it feel like an Holocaust modern Holocaust that the Kamas just wanted to kill everyone they saw"
- Technique: Amplification of maximalist framing. The reporter allows the Holocaust comparison to stand without any journalistic contextualization. This is an extraordinarily charged historical comparison that, in balanced journalism, would typically be noted as the speaker's personal characterization.
- Why problematic: CBC's own journalistic standards require that reporters contextualize claims, particularly historically charged ones. Allowing this comparison to stand uncontextualized implicitly endorses it and contributes to a maximalist framing of the conflict.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOR

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in questioning style, follow-up, interruptions, and sympathy signals from the reporter.

Finding 1:

- Location: Interview with Itar Jari
- Quote: "how do you feel seeing all these cars"
- Technique: Exclusively emotional questioning. The reporter asks only about feelings, not about facts, context, or the interviewee's views on the broader conflict. This is appropriate for a trauma-focused segment but becomes problematic when it is the only mode of engagement throughout the entire piece.
- Why problematic: Emotional questioning generates empathy but not understanding. When applied exclusively to one side of a conflict, it creates asymmetric emotional engagement.

Finding 2:

- Location: Following Itamar's statement about Gaza
- Quote: "we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore don't want to scare anymore not there and not in my house and not in another country"
- Technique: No follow-up question. The reporter allows this statement — which expresses a desire for Gaza's elimination — to stand without any follow-up, challenge, or contextualization.
- Why problematic: This is the most significant moderation failure in the segment. A statement of this nature, made during an active military campaign, requires journalistic engagement. The absence of any follow-up implicitly endorses or normalizes the sentiment.

Finding 3:

- Location: Throughout
- Technique: Sympathetic narration. The reporter's narration consistently uses language that signals emotional alignment with the Israeli subjects: "haunting," "traumatized," "suffering," "hope here can be hard to hang on to."
- Why problematic: While empathetic reporting on trauma victims is legitimate, the consistent use of sympathetic language in narration — combined with the complete absence of equivalent language for Palestinian victims — constitutes a systematic moderation asymmetry.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Whether hard/confrontational questions are asked of some guests while soft/sympathetic questions are asked of others.

Finding 1:

- Quote: "how do you feel seeing all these cars"
- Technique: The only direct question in the segment is purely emotional. No factual, analytical, or challenging questions are posed to any interviewee.
- Why problematic: The absence of any challenging questions to any interviewee means the segment functions as a platform for testimony rather than journalism. While this may be appropriate for a human interest piece, it is problematic when the subject matter is an active military conflict with significant political dimensions.

Finding 2:

- Absent questions to ZAKA representatives: No questions about ZAKA's mandate, funding, relationship with Israeli authorities, or the organization's position on the military campaign.
- Why problematic: ZAKA representatives are presented as neutral forensic authorities. Questions about their institutional context would have provided important framing for viewers.

Finding 3:

- Absent questions about the statement on Gaza's elimination: The reporter does not ask Itamar to clarify or elaborate on his statement about Gaza "not being here anymore."
- Why problematic: This is the most politically significant statement in the segment and receives no journalistic scrutiny whatsoever.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance that misrepresents actual evidence or consensus, or the absence of balance where it is required.

Note: This segment does not attempt false balance — it makes no pretense of presenting multiple perspectives. The score reflects the absence of the problem of false balance specifically, while acknowledging that the broader problem is the complete absence of balance of any kind.

Finding 1: The segment does not present any false equivalences. It is straightforwardly one-sided rather than falsely balanced. This is a different — and in some ways more transparent — form of bias than false balance.

Finding 2: The segment's one-sidedness is so complete that the question of false balance does not arise. There is no attempt to present a Palestinian perspective that could be characterized as falsely equivalent.

Finding 3: The absence of false balance does not mitigate the segment's overall bias — it simply means the bias operates through omission and framing rather than through the specific technique of false equivalence.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What becomes "the issue" through the broadcast's framing, and what is excluded from discussion entirely.

Finding 1:

- Agenda set: The broadcast establishes that the central issue of the Israel-Gaza conflict is Israeli civilian suffering from the October 7 attacks.
- Excluded from agenda: Palestinian civilian suffering from the ongoing military campaign; the political and historical context of the conflict; the question of proportionality in Israel's military response; the hostage situation; international law.
- Why problematic: Agenda-setting is one of the most powerful tools in journalism. By defining "the story" as exclusively about Israeli victims, the broadcast implicitly defines Palestinian victims as outside the story.

Finding 2:

- Quote: "this lot tells so much of the story of October 7th"
- Technique: The reporter explicitly frames the vehicle lot as telling "so much of the story" — but the story being told is exclusively Israeli. The phrase "so much of the story" implies comprehensiveness while delivering exclusivity.
- Why problematic: The claim to comprehensiveness ("so much of the story") while delivering a radically incomplete picture is a form of agenda-setting that misleads viewers about the scope of the coverage.

Finding 3:

- Structural agenda: The segment's entire structure — location, interviewees, narration, emotional arc — is designed to make Israeli civilian suffering the totality of the viewer's experience of this conflict moment. Everything else is either absent or subordinated to this agenda.
- Why problematic: For a public broadcaster with a mandate to inform Canadians about complex international issues, setting an agenda that excludes the majority of the conflict's complexity is a fundamental failure of public service journalism.



CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

A) Summary Table: All 15 Criteria

#	Criterion	Score (0–10)	Key Finding
1	Framing	7	Entire segment framed as Israeli memorial; Palestinian suffering attributed causally to Hamas, not to Israeli military decisions
2	Word Choice & Terminology	6	Visceral language applied exclusively to Israeli suffering; artillery fire into Gaza described atmospherically
3	Expert Selection	6	All sources are Israeli; ZAKA presented as neutral authority without institutional disclosure
4	Selective Omission	8	10,000+ Palestinian casualties at time of broadcast entirely absent; Itamar's eliminationist statement unchallenged
5	Moderation Behavior	7	Exclusively emotional questioning; no challenge to extreme statements; sympathetic narration throughout
6	Time Distribution	8	100% of interview time to Israeli civilians; 0% to Palestinian, neutral, or contextualizing voices
7	Question Asymmetry	6	Only one question asked; purely emotional; no analytical or challenging questions to any interviewee
8	Guilt by Association	4	Hamas vehicles physically separated and morally contaminated; asymmetric moral characterization
9	Numerical Manipulation	5	Unsourced statistics; Palestinian casualty figures entirely absent
10	Timing & Placement	5	Broadcast at peak of Gaza bombardment; emotional arc structure more suited to advocacy than journalism
12	Source Selection	7	Entirely homogeneous Israeli sources; no international, Palestinian, or independent voices
13	Selective Outrage	8	Hamas atrocities documented with moral weight; Israeli military conduct entirely absent; eliminationist statement unchallenged
14	False Balance	3	Segment does not attempt false balance — it is straightforwardly one-sided; score reflects absence of this specific technique
15	Agenda-Setting	8	Israeli civilian suffering defined as the totality of the story; all other dimensions excluded

B) Overall Scores

- Criteria Score: $(7+6+6+8+7+8+6+4+5+5+7+7+8+3+8) \div 15 = 95 \div 15 = 6.3$

C) Top 3 Manipulation Techniques

1. Selective Omission (Score: 8/10)



The most consequential technique in this segment is what is absent. The broadcast was filmed 5 km from Gaza during an active military campaign that had already killed thousands of Palestinian civilians. The complete absence of any reference to Palestinian casualties, Palestinian voices, or the human consequences of Israeli military operations creates a radically distorted picture of the conflict. This is not accidental — the reporter physically observes artillery fire into Gaza and chooses to describe it as atmospheric rather than consequential. Selective omission of this magnitude, in a conflict context, is not a journalistic oversight; it is an editorial position.

2. Emotional Architecture / Narrative Framing (Criteria 1, 11, 10)

The segment is constructed as an emotional journey — from the visceral horror of burned cars and severed limbs, through personal testimony of grief and survivor's guilt, to the fragile hope of a balloon at a car seat. This is the narrative structure of advocacy filmmaking, not balanced journalism. The opening music, the poetic narration ("the silence here today symbolizes so much suffering"), and the carefully chosen closing image all serve an emotional agenda that precludes analytical engagement. Viewers are guided to feel, not to think.

3. Unchallenged Amplification of Extreme Statements (Criteria 4, 5, 13)

Two statements in this segment — the Holocaust comparison and the desire for Gaza to "not be here anymore" — are of extraordinary political and ethical significance. Both are allowed to stand without any journalistic challenge, contextualization, or follow-up. The unchallenged amplification of extreme statements is a powerful technique: it allows a broadcaster to convey a position while maintaining plausible deniability ("we were just reporting what people said"). In a conflict context, this technique is particularly consequential because it normalizes positions that, if subjected to journalistic scrutiny, would require significant qualification.

D) 3 Core Messages Embedded in the Broadcast

Content Message (What the viewer learns):

"The October 7 Hamas attacks were an act of unprecedented barbarism that traumatized Israeli society. The ongoing conflict is a consequence of that attack. Palestinian suffering, if it exists, is Hamas's responsibility."

- Technique: Causal attribution framing + selective omission
- Evidence: "smoke hangs over Gaza just about 5 km away from here outgoing artillery fire booms reminders of the war and Untold suffering triggered by this attack" — the phrase "triggered by this attack" assigns all subsequent suffering to Hamas, removing Israeli military decision-making from the moral equation.

Personal Message (Who is presented positively/negatively):

"Israelis are fully human — traumatized, grieving, guilty, hopeful, frightened. Hamas is a force of pure evil. Palestinians do not appear as human beings in this story."

- Technique: Humanization/dehumanization asymmetry + source selection
- Evidence: Five Israeli civilians are given names, voices, emotions, and personal stories. Hamas is described through its actions ("storming," "killing," "abducting"). Palestinians are entirely absent as human subjects. The asymmetry is total.

Societal Message (What worldview is reinforced):

"In this conflict, there is a clear victim (Israel) and a clear aggressor (Hamas/Gaza). The appropriate response is support for Israel's military campaign. Questioning that campaign is not part of the conversation."

- Technique: Agenda-setting + unchallenged amplification
- Evidence: "we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore" — this statement, expressing support for the elimination of Gaza, is the closest the segment comes to a political position on the military campaign. Its unchallenged inclusion, as the final substantive interview statement before the emotional closing, positions it as a reasonable conclusion to the narrative.

E) Classification

Classification: 4.1–6.0 — CLEAR ONE-SIDEDNESS



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

This segment exhibits clear, systematic one-sidedness that goes beyond the legitimate journalistic choice to focus on a specific story angle. The complete absence of Palestinian voices, the unchallenged amplification of extreme statements, the causal framing that attributes all conflict suffering to Hamas, and the emotional architecture that precludes analytical engagement collectively constitute a pattern of one-sided coverage that fails the standards of balanced public broadcasting.

F) Summary

This segment, broadcast on CBC's The National approximately one month after the October 7, 2023 Hamas attacks, documents Israeli civilian suffering with genuine journalistic empathy but fails the core standards of CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices in several significant respects. The JSP's requirements for accuracy, fairness, balance, and impartiality are not met: the segment presents no Palestinian perspective, allows extreme statements to stand unchallenged, and frames the ongoing military conflict — which was killing thousands of Palestinian civilians at the time of broadcast — as a consequence of Hamas's actions rather than as a subject of independent journalistic inquiry. The Broadcasting Act, Section 3(1)(l), requires that CBC "provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern"; a segment that allocates 100% of its interview time to one side of an active military conflict, while physically observing the bombardment of the other side, does not meet this standard. The segment's most significant regulatory failure is the unchallenged inclusion of a statement expressing a desire for Gaza to "not be here anymore" — a statement that, in the context of an active military campaign, required journalistic engagement that was entirely absent. While human interest reporting on trauma victims is a legitimate and important journalistic form, the CBC's public broadcasting mandate requires that such reporting be situated within a broader informational context that this segment entirely fails to provide.



CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary Note

This segment does not address Canadian domestic politics directly. The party-political bias assessment must therefore be conducted through the lens of how the segment's framing aligns with or diverges from each party's stated positions on the Israel-Gaza conflict as of November 2023, and whether the segment's editorial choices implicitly favor or disadvantage any party's political position.

Party Bias Table

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Evidence & Interpretation
NDP	-3	The NDP had called for an immediate ceasefire and humanitarian corridors by early November 2023. The segment's framing — which presents Israeli military action as a justified response to Hamas atrocities and allows a statement about Gaza's elimination to stand unchallenged — directly contradicts and implicitly delegitimizes the NDP's policy position. No ceasefire perspective is presented. Quote: "we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore" — unchallenged, this statement implicitly endorses the continuation of military operations, the opposite of the NDP's position.
Green Party	-2	The Green Party had also expressed support for a ceasefire and humanitarian law compliance. The segment's framing, which attributes all conflict suffering to Hamas and presents Israeli military action as a natural consequence, implicitly undermines the Green Party's position that both sides must be held to international humanitarian law standards. The absence of any IHL expert or human rights organization voice disadvantages the Green Party's framing of the issue.
Liberal Party	+2	The Liberal government's position in early November 2023 was to support Israel's right to self-defense while calling for humanitarian pauses (not a full ceasefire). The segment's framing — which documents Israeli suffering, attributes the conflict to Hamas, and presents Israeli military action as a justified response — broadly aligns with the Liberal government's stated position. The segment does not challenge the "right to self-defense" framework that the Liberal government was using. Quote: "Untold suffering triggered by this attack" — this causal framing aligns with the Liberal government's public statements attributing the conflict to Hamas.
Bloc Québécois	0	The Bloc's position on the conflict was nuanced — supporting humanitarian law and expressing concern for civilian casualties on both sides while not calling for an immediate ceasefire. The segment neither particularly advantages nor disadvantages this position, as it does not engage with the humanitarian law dimension at all. The Bloc's position is simply not addressed.
Conservative Party	+3	The Conservative Party under Pierre Poilievre was among the most vocal supporters of Israel's military campaign, explicitly rejecting ceasefire calls and framing the conflict as a fight against terrorism. The segment's framing — Hamas as pure aggressor, Israeli military action as justified response, no Palestinian civilian perspective, unchallenged eliminationist statement — most closely aligns with the Conservative Party's public position on the conflict. Quote: "Hamas militants storming the festival grounds killing hundreds of young people" — the consistent framing of Hamas as a terrorist/militant force without any contextualizing political analysis aligns with the Conservative Party's framing of the conflict as a counter-terrorism operation.



People's Party	+1	The PPC's position on the conflict was broadly pro-Israel but also isolationist — Maxime Bernier had expressed support for Israel while also questioning Canadian involvement. The segment's framing is broadly consistent with the PPC's pro-Israel position but does not engage with the isolationist dimension. The slight positive score reflects the alignment on the pro-Israel framing rather than any specific PPC policy position.
----------------	----	---

Summary Statistics

Most Favored Party: Conservative Party of Canada (CPC) — Score: +3

The segment's framing most closely aligns with the CPC's stated position of unconditional support for Israel's military campaign, rejection of ceasefire calls, and framing of the conflict as a counter-terrorism operation.

Most Disadvantaged Party: NDP — Score: -3

The segment's framing most directly contradicts the NDP's ceasefire position and its call for the application of international humanitarian law to both sides of the conflict.

Average Deviation from 0: $(|-3| + |-2| + |+2| + |0| + |+3| + |+1|) \div 6 = 11 \div 6 = 1.83$



CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

A) CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

Accuracy

Assessment: Partially met with significant gaps.

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Unsourced statistic	JSP Accuracy — "We verify information before it is broadcast"	"near Oz almost half of its residents killed or taken hostage" — no source cited	Statistical claim presented without attribution or verification	Minor
Uncontextualized Holocaust comparison	JSP Accuracy — "We provide context"	"you know it feel like an Holocaust modern Holocaust" — no contextualization	Historically charged comparison presented without journalistic context	Moderate
Causal attribution	JSP Accuracy — "We are careful not to oversimplify"	"Untold suffering triggered by this attack" — attributes all conflict suffering to Hamas	Oversimplification of a complex causal chain	Moderate

Fairness

Assessment: Not met.

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
No Palestinian voices	JSP Fairness — "We seek out and represent a diversity of perspectives"	100% of interview time allocated to Israeli civilians	Complete absence of Palestinian perspective in a segment about an active conflict affecting both populations	Significant
Unchallenged eliminationist statement	JSP Fairness — "We do not allow our platforms to be used to promote hatred"	"we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore" — unchallenged	Statement expressing desire for Gaza's elimination allowed to stand without challenge	Significant

Balance

Assessment: Not met.

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
---------	----------	----------	-----------	----------



Structural imbalance	JSP Balance — "We present a wide range of perspectives"	Entire segment presents exclusively Israeli perspective	Structural failure of balance in coverage of an active military conflict	Significant
Absent context	JSP Balance — "We provide the context necessary for understanding"	No reference to Palestinian casualties, international law, or political context	Failure to provide contextual balance	Significant

Impartiality

Assessment: Not met.

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Sympathetic narration	JSP Impartiality — "We do not take sides"	"the silence here today symbolizes so much suffering" — reporter interprets environment as symbol of Israeli suffering	Reporter adopts emotional alignment with one side	Moderate
Atmospheric framing of military action	JSP Impartiality — "We report facts without editorial coloring"	"outgoing artillery fire booms reminders of the war" — Israeli military action framed atmospherically	Editorial framing that minimizes the significance of Israeli military operations	Moderate

Independence

Assessment: No evidence of direct external influence. The bias appears to be editorial rather than externally imposed.

B) Broadcasting Act, S.C. 1991, c. 11, Section 3(1)

Section 3(1)(l) — Reasonable opportunity for differing views:

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
No differing views presented	S.3(1)(l) — "provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern"	100% of content presents a single perspective on an active military conflict	Complete failure to provide differing views on a matter of significant public concern	Significant

Section 3(1)(d)(i) — Safeguard and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada:

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Failure to inform on complex international issue	S.3(1)(d)(i) — public broadcaster must	Segment provides no analytical framework for understanding a	Failure to provide the informational foundation necessary	Moderate



	serve the public interest	complex international conflict affecting Canadian foreign policy and domestic communities	for informed democratic participation	
--	---------------------------	---	---------------------------------------	--

C) CRTC Conditions of Licence

High Standard of Journalistic Ethics:

Finding	Standard	Evidence	Violation	Severity
Unchallenged extreme statement	CRTC journalistic ethics — responsible reporting	"we just wait for the end for to know that Gaza is not here anymore" — no journalistic response	Failure to apply basic journalistic scrutiny to an extreme statement	Significant
Absence of source diversity	CRTC journalistic ethics — balanced reporting	All sources from a single national/cultural perspective	Failure to meet minimum source diversity standards for conflict reporting	Significant

Overall Regulatory Assessment

This segment, as broadcast on CBC's The National, fails to meet several core requirements of CBC's Journalistic Standards and Practices, the Broadcasting Act Section 3(1)(l), and the CRTC's conditions of licence regarding journalistic ethics. The most significant regulatory failures are: (1) the complete absence of Palestinian voices or perspectives in a segment about an active military conflict affecting both Israeli and Palestinian populations; (2) the unchallenged broadcast of a statement expressing a desire for Gaza's elimination, which required journalistic engagement that was entirely absent; and (3) the structural framing of the conflict as exclusively about Israeli suffering, which fails the Broadcasting Act's requirement to provide a reasonable opportunity for differing views on matters of public concern. While the segment's documentation of Israeli civilian trauma is legitimate and important journalism, its failure to situate that documentation within any broader informational context — at a moment when thousands of Palestinian civilians were being killed in an active military campaign — constitutes a systemic failure of the public broadcasting mandate that CBC is legally and institutionally obligated to fulfill.

Source Credibility Check

Source/Organization	Funding Source	Conflicts of Interest	Credibility Assessment	Counter-Voice Offered?
ZAKA	Israeli government grants; private Israeli and diaspora Jewish donors; international Jewish philanthropic organizations	Operates exclusively within Israeli Jewish society; institutional mandate focused on Israeli Jewish victims; no mandate regarding Palestinian casualties	High for its stated purpose (body recovery); Low as a neutral source on the broader conflict	No
Itar Jari (survivor)	N/A — civilian witness	Personal trauma and loss; survivor's guilt; expressed support for Israeli military campaign	High as personal testimony; Low as analytical source	No



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Heim (ZAKA volunteer)	See ZAKA above	See ZAKA above	High as personal testimony; Medium as organizational representative	No
Hila Elie Mik / No Nino	N/A — civilian witnesses	Friends of festival survivor; emotional investment in Israeli narrative	High as personal testimony; Low as analytical source	No
Reporter narration	CBC/Radio-Canada — public broadcaster funded by Parliamentary appropriation and advertising	Institutional mandate to serve Canadian public interest; potential editorial pressure in conflict coverage	Medium — narration shows consistent editorial alignment with Israeli perspective	No

Overall Source Credibility Finding: Every source in this segment is either a direct victim of the October 7 attacks, a member of an Israeli civil society organization, or a friend of a victim. While these are credible and important voices for the specific purpose of documenting Israeli civilian suffering, they collectively constitute a source base with zero diversity of perspective. No independent expert, no international observer, no Palestinian voice, and no analytical source of any kind is included. For a public broadcaster covering an active military conflict, this represents a fundamental failure of source diversity that undermines the segment's credibility as journalism rather than advocacy.

End of Analysis Report — Version 1.0-cbc

Analyst: Senior Media Analysis Framework

Date of Analysis: Based on broadcast file 20231108



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	6	●●●
2	SOURCE SELECTION	7	●●●●
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	8	●●●●
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	8	●●●●
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	5	●●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	4	●●
7	TIMING & PLACEMENT	5	●●●
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	8	●●●●
9	COMPLETENESS	8	●●●●
10	FRAMING	7	●●●●
11	WORD CHOICE & TERMINOLOGY	6	●●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOR	7	●●●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	6	●●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	3	●●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8	●●●●

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.6/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.2/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.4/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
7	Significant finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
8–9	Severe finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favored	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favored	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.

Legal and Methodological Notes



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

No factual determination

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.

No legal judgment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 3(1)(l). The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular CRTC).

No proof of causation

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

No judgment of intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

Heuristic comparison tool

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

Legal Basis Canada — CBC/Radio-Canada

Law

Broadcasting Act (S.C. 1991, c. 11)

Relevant Sections

- Section 3(1)(d): The Canadian broadcasting system should safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.
- Section 3(1)(l): The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national public broadcaster, should provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains; be predominantly and distinctively Canadian; reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences; actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression; be in English and in French; contribute to shared national consciousness and identity.
- Section 3(1)(m): The programming provided by the Corporation should be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means.

CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices (JSP)

6 Core Principles:

1. **Accuracy:** Facts correct and verified
2. **Fairness:** Fair treatment of all parties
3. **Balance:** Balanced representation of controversial topics
4. **Impartiality:** Impartial reporting
5. **Integrity:** Journalistic integrity
6. **Independence:** Editorial independence

Online Legislation

- C-11 (Online Streaming Act): Streaming regulation
- C-18 (Online News Act): News compensation

Regulatory Authority

- CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission): Regulation, licensing
- CBC Ombudsman: Internal complaints body (not independent, no sanctioning authority)

Special Note

Canada has no independent external regulator comparable to Switzerland's UBI. The CBC Ombudsman is an internal body. CBC left the CBSC (Canadian Broadcast Standards Council) in 2009.

Complaints Process

1. CBC Ombudsman (internal)
2. CRTC (licensing conditions)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

References

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced Reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



You think you see the world. In Wirklichkeit siehst du den Rahmen, den jemand um sie gelegt hat. Framing ist die älteste und eleganteste Manipulationstechnik der world. Sie verändert nicht die Fakten – sie verändert, was wir aus den Fakten machen. Wie wir fühlen. Was wir glauben. Wie wir entscheiden. Und sie funktioniert – weil wir alle mitmachen. Täglich. Unbewusst. Auch du. Dieses Buch ist kein trockenes Lehrbuch. Es ist ein Übungsbuch – spielerisch, direkt, voller Beispiele aus dem echten Leben. Du lernst nicht nur, wie andere dich framen. Du lernst, wie du selbst framest – und wie du es bewusst und fair einsetzen kannst.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year – compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can file a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

But: It is not independent. It has no sanctioning power. And it decides in 99.6% of all cases: nothing.

This analysis exposes the system – factual, precise, without polemics. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional review showing: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria – it is not proportionate, not separated by powers, not market-based.

The authority supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it should be overseeing.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint – and for anyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.