



SABC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20240112_SA-Israel ICJ case / ICJ hears SA's genocide case.en

Broadcast: SABC-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-25 10:10

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6

OVERALL SCORE

6.5/10

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	EFF	MK	ANC	IFP	DA	ActionSA	PA	FF+
CHES	1.50	3.50	4.50	6.00	6.50	6.50	7.00	8.00
Spectrum	Left	Left	Center	Right	Right	Right	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)

3.2 / 10

Left-favoring

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.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

South Africa has been governed since June 2024 by a Government of National Unity (GNU) — a broad coalition led by the ANC (39.8%, 159 seats) after losing its 30-year parliamentary majority in the 29 May 2024 elections. The GNU includes the DA (21.8%, 87 seats), IFP (4.3%, 17 seats), PA (2.3%, 9 seats), FF+ (1.5%, 6 seats), and five smaller parties, totalling approximately 287 of 400 seats. The main opposition outside the GNU consists of MK (14.6%, 58 seats, Jacob Zuma), EFF (9.5%, 39 seats, Julius Malema), ActionSA (6 seats), and ACDP (3 seats). Note: This broadcast dates from January 2024, predating the May 2024 elections. At time of broadcast, the ANC governed alone with a parliamentary majority; the GNU did not yet exist.

Party	CHES L-R (est.)	Seats (2024)	Gov/Opposition	Core Position
EFF	1.5	39	Opposition	Far-left; land expropriation, nationalisation
PAC	2.0	1	Opposition	Left-wing Pan-Africanist
MK	3.0	58	Opposition	Left-populist, Zuma personality cult
ANC	4.0	159	Government (GNU lead)	Centre-left, broad church
UDM	4.5	3	GNU	Centre-left, rural base
Rise Mzansi	4.5	2	GNU	Centre-left progressive
GOOD	4.5	1	GNU	Centre-left progressive
Al Jama-ah	4.0	2	GNU	Left economics, socially conservative
DA	6.0	87	GNU	Centre-right, free market, liberal
ActionSA	6.5	6	Opposition	Centre-right, anti-immigration
IFP	6.5	17	GNU	Right-wing, Zulu nationalist
PA	7.0	9	GNU	Right-wing populist
ACDP	7.5	3	Opposition	Right-wing Christian conservative
FF+	8.0	6	GNU	Right-wing, Afrikaner interest

South Africa's ICJ genocide case against Israel (filed December 2023) is one of the most politically charged foreign policy actions in the country's post-apartheid history. The ANC government under President Ramaphosa positioned the case as a moral and legal obligation rooted in South Africa's own history of oppression, drawing explicit parallels to apartheid. The EFF and MK strongly supported the case; the DA expressed reservations about South Africa's standing and the framing of the conflict. The case thus became a domestic political flashpoint, with coverage of it functioning as a proxy for broader debates about ANC foreign policy, South Africa's role in the Global South, and the country's relationship with Western powers.

The SABC (South African Broadcasting Corporation) is the public broadcaster mandated under the Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 to provide programming that is fair, accurate, impartial, and serves all South Africans. Section 6 of the Act and the BCCSA Code require balanced coverage of controversial public affairs, including the presentation of opposing views. The SABC has a documented history of political capture during the Hlaudi Motsoeneng era (approximately 2012–2016), and questions about residual ANC editorial influence remain relevant to any bias analysis. On foreign



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

policy matters — particularly the Gaza conflict — the SABC's coverage is politically consequential given the ANC government's direct involvement as a party to the ICJ proceedings.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Note: This broadcast dates from January 2024, before the May 2024 elections. Party seat numbers and GNU coalition structure did not yet exist. Bias assessment therefore focuses on the ANC government's foreign policy position (the ICJ case) and opposition reactions as they existed at time of broadcast.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Party Programme Position
ANC	+2	01:11–04:13 — South Africa's ICJ application framed as "bold," "methodical," "a good lesson in law." ANC programme position: strong pro-Palestinian foreign policy, ICJ case as moral obligation. Representation: broadly accurate but uncritically celebratory rather than neutral. Slightly favourable beyond mere accuracy.
DA	-2	Not directly mentioned. DA's position — scepticism about South Africa's legal standing, concern about Hamas association — entirely absent from broadcast. Programme position: nuanced on Gaza, critical of one-sided framing. Omission constitutes a distortion by exclusion.
MK	0	Not mentioned. Not relevant to this specific broadcast topic at time of airing (January 2024, pre-election).
EFF	0	Not mentioned. EFF's strong pro-Palestinian position would have aligned with broadcast framing but was not cited.
IFP	0	Not mentioned. Not relevant to this specific broadcast topic.
PA	0	Not mentioned. Not relevant to this specific broadcast topic.
FF+	0	Not mentioned. FF+ position on Gaza/Israel (more sympathetic to Israel) entirely absent.
ActionSA	0	Not mentioned. Not relevant to this specific broadcast topic.

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate representation: ANC (Score +2) — the ANC's foreign policy position is represented broadly correctly, though with an uncritical celebratory tone that goes beyond neutral accuracy.
- Strongest distortion: DA (Score -2) — the DA's substantive reservations about the ICJ case, South Africa's legal standing, and the Hamas association issue are entirely absent, creating a false impression of domestic political consensus.
- Average deviation from 0: 0.5
- Conclusion: The broadcast presents the ANC government's ICJ case as a matter of national pride and legal competence without engaging any domestic political dissent. The DA's publicly stated concerns — which were prominent in South African political discourse at the time — are completely unrepresented. This creates a misleading picture of domestic political unity around a deeply contested foreign policy decision.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: SABC News — ICJ Hearing Coverage (South Africa v. Israel)
- Date: January 12, 2024 (inferred from transcript content: "Day 2" of ICJ hearings; South Africa presented on 11 January 2024, Israel on 12 January 2024)
- Estimated length: Approximately 16 minutes 46 seconds (transcript ends at 16:46)
- Presenter/Reporter: Sakina (surname not given in transcript)
- Interviewed persons:

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Professor Chris Landsberg	Head of Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg	Academic; no stated party affiliation	Centre-left (based on stated positions in broadcast)

Main Topic

South Africa's ICJ genocide case against Israel: assessment of South Africa's Day 1 presentation and preview of Israel's Day 2 defence.

World-View Context

The ICJ case (Republic of South Africa v. State of Israel) was filed on 29 December 2023 under the Genocide Convention of 1948. South Africa alleged that Israel's military campaign in Gaza, launched after the Hamas attacks of 7 October 2023, constituted acts of genocide. The case divided the international community sharply: the Global South broadly supported South Africa's standing to bring the case; Western governments (US, UK, Germany) were largely critical. The case intersected with live geopolitical tensions including Houthi attacks on Red Sea shipping, US-Iran proxy dynamics, and the broader question of international law's enforceability against powerful states. Domestically in South Africa, the case was politically significant: the ANC government championed it; the DA expressed reservations; the EFF and MK were enthusiastically supportive.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Professor Chris Landsberg — Head of Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg

Timestamp: 00:54–01:08

Statement: "we're joined in Studio by the head of diplomacy and foreign policy at the University of J hburg Professor Chris lansburg"

Classification: Academic specialist in diplomacy and foreign policy; no stated party affiliation; publicly known as broadly sympathetic to ANC foreign policy positions and the Global South perspective.

Missing countervoice: An international criminal law specialist (e.g., from the International Criminal Court bar, or a scholar specialising in the Genocide Convention) would have provided technically grounded assessment of the legal threshold. A scholar with a different geopolitical orientation would have provided balance.

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: University of Johannesburg — public university, state-funded. No direct financial conflict of interest with the ICJ case. However, South African public universities operate within a political environment where ANC foreign policy positions are broadly mainstream in academic discourse.

(b) MANDATE: Professor Landsberg's mandate is diplomacy and foreign policy — a relevant but not specifically legal expertise. The broadcast concerns a legal proceeding (ICJ genocide application) requiring specialist knowledge of international criminal law, the Genocide Convention threshold, and ICJ procedure. His mandate is partially compatible with neutral assessment of diplomatic dimensions but not with technical legal analysis.

D1 Conflict of Interest: 0 — No direct financial conflict; however, his publicly stated positions align consistently with the ANC's foreign policy orientation, creating a soft ideological alignment.

D2 Personal Risk: +1 — As an academic, he faces some reputational risk for his assessments, though the dominant South African academic consensus supports the ICJ case, reducing this risk.

D3 Subject Competence: 0 — Competent in diplomacy and foreign policy; not a specialist in international criminal law or the Genocide Convention. His expertise is adjacent but not precisely matched to the legal questions at the centre of the broadcast.

D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — His positions appear consistent with his prior public statements on South African foreign policy and the Global South.

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 — Several statements are analytical but others are clearly advocacy-oriented (e.g., "bold country South Africa of all," "I'm going to be um uh very critical of America"). The broadcast does not distinguish between his analytical and advocacy roles.

D6 Source Level: 0 — Secondary source; he is analysing and interpreting primary events (the ICJ hearings) rather than providing primary evidence.

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW (-4 to +4)

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Yes. Professor Landsberg is introduced as "head of diplomacy and foreign policy" — an institutional title that connotes academic neutrality. However, his statements throughout the broadcast are consistently sympathetic to South Africa's case and critical of Israel and the United States. The framing as a neutral academic expert obscures his advocacy orientation. This constitutes Technique No. 2 (Source Selection).



Missing Expert Groups:

- International criminal law specialist with expertise in the Genocide Convention
- Legal scholar with a different geopolitical orientation (e.g., from a Western or Israeli academic institution)
- South African opposition political analyst

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Professor Chris Landsberg — Head of Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg	0	+1	0	+1	-1	0	+1	YELLOW

Summary (Matrix Result):

- Professor Chris Landsberg: **YELLOW (+1/12)** — Relevant but not precisely matched expertise; advocacy orientation not disclosed; framed as neutral academic while consistently advancing one side of the argument.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Professor Chris Landsberg (sole source)

Timestamp 00:54–16:29 — Statement: [entire interview]

(a) Funding and governance: University of Johannesburg, state-funded public university.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Professor Landsberg's publicly stated positions align with the ANC government's foreign policy orientation. As the sole source for a 16-minute broadcast on a highly contested legal and political matter, his perspective dominates the entire editorial frame without challenge.

(c) Missing counterbalancing source: An Israeli legal representative, a Western international law scholar, or a South African opposition analyst would have provided the structural counterweight required by BCCSA Code Clause 18.

Source 2: Implicit reference to President Ramaphosa

Timestamp 09:01–09:10 — Quote: "I was surprised at even the how the president celebrated the performance of of South Africa"

(a) The President's celebratory framing of South Africa's Day 1 performance is referenced approvingly, lending executive authority to the positive assessment without critical examination.

(b) No source is cited for this reference; it is presented as common knowledge from "newspaper clippings."

Source 3: Implicit reference to Anthony Blinken

Timestamp 05:35–05:43 — Quote: "he didn't Min his words day before yesterday in Israel about rubbishing South Africa's um case literally call it calling it a a distraction"

(a) Blinken's statement is cited as evidence of American hypocrisy, not as a substantive legal or policy position. No direct quote from Blinken is provided; the characterisation is the expert's paraphrase.

(b) Missing counterbalancing source: Blinken's actual statement and its full context.

Rumour Check (Penalty Points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 07:09–07:18

Claim: "they reportedly have weapons of mass destruction"

Word marker: "reportedly" / "purportedly"

Primary source present: No — Penalty point applied (+1 to score)

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 07:29–07:37

Claim: "the deputy minister in Israel made that point about why don't we just use nuclear weapons and and wipe out uh the the the Palestinians"

Word marker: None — stated as fact



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

Primary source present: No direct citation, no name given for the "deputy minister." This is a serious unverified claim presented without attribution. (+1 penalty point)

Summary: The broadcast relies on a single source whose orientation aligns with the editorial position of the broadcast. Two significant unverified claims are presented without primary source citation, one of which (the Israeli deputy minister nuclear weapons statement) is particularly serious given its inflammatory nature.



3. AIRTIME DISTRIBUTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Professor Chris Landsberg (pro-South Africa / critical of Israel and US): approximately 12 minutes 30 seconds (approximately 75%)
- Presenter Sakina (framing questions, largely sympathetic): approximately 3 minutes 30 seconds (approximately 21%)
- Israel's position (paraphrased by Landsberg, not directly represented): approximately 2 minutes embedded within Landsberg's analysis (approximately 12% — but framed as anticipated attack strategy, not as legitimate argument)
- Direct representation of Israeli, US, or opposition South African perspective: 0 minutes (0%)

Summary: The entire broadcast is dominated by a single voice whose perspective is consistently sympathetic to South Africa's case. No representative of any opposing position — Israeli, American, or domestic South African opposition — is given any direct speaking time. This is a structural imbalance that cannot be remedied by the expert's occasional paraphrasing of anticipated Israeli arguments.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

Israel's "hypocrisy" charge against South Africa — including South Africa's silence on Russian atrocities in Ukraine, its relations with Iran, and its abstention on UN resolutions condemning Russia — is mentioned in the introduction (00:15–00:18) but never substantively addressed.

Relevant at: 00:15–00:18 — "they called it one of the greatest shows of hypocrisy in history"

Effect

The charge is introduced and then dropped, creating the impression that it is too absurd to merit engagement, without actually refuting it. Viewers are left without the information needed to assess it.

Omission 2:

Context

The 7 October 2023 Hamas attacks — the direct trigger for Israel's military campaign — are mentioned only as an anticipated Israeli legal argument (11:29–12:14), not as an independent factual context requiring neutral treatment.

Relevant at: 11:07–11:27 — "for 75 years right there's been suppression what do you expect people to do at some point they're going to take up arms and they're going to do a 7th of October"

Effect

The framing contextualises 7 October as an understandable consequence of Israeli policy rather than as an independent atrocity. The 1,200 Israeli deaths, the hostage-taking, and the documented Hamas war crimes of that day are not mentioned as independent facts.

Omission 3:

Context

The legal threshold for genocide under the Genocide Convention — specifically the requirement to prove specific intent (*dolus specialis*) to destroy a group "as such" — is the central legal question in the case. It is not explained or examined.

Relevant at: 08:42–09:00 — "they needed to show that there is indeed evidence to substantiate this claim of genocide"

Effect

Without explaining the legal threshold, viewers cannot assess whether South Africa's evidence is legally sufficient. The broadcast treats the genocide characterisation as essentially established rather than as a contested legal question.

Summary: Three major omissions systematically favour South Africa's legal and moral position: the hypocrisy charge is dropped without engagement, the 7 October attacks are contextualised as provoked rather than treated as independent atrocities, and the legal threshold for genocide is never explained, leaving viewers unable to critically assess the case.

Missing Voices

- Independent international law specialist (e.g., genocide law expert): Would have provided a neutral assessment of whether South Africa's evidence meets the legal threshold for genocide under the Genocide Convention.



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

- DA spokesperson on foreign affairs: Would have represented the significant domestic political opposition to the ICJ case and raised questions about South Africa's legal standing.
- Israeli government representative or legal expert: Would have presented Israel's defence arguments as substantive legal positions rather than as anticipated political attacks.
- Palestinian human rights organisation representative: Would have provided direct testimony on conditions in Gaza, grounding the legal arguments in lived experience.
- Israeli civilian or hostage family representative: Would have contextualised the 7 October attacks and the Israeli security rationale.
- Geopolitical analyst with a pro-Western or neutral perspective: Would have provided a counterweight to the broadcast's consistent framing of US/Western positions as hypocritical.
- South African legal academic specialising in international criminal law: Would have assessed the jurisdictional issues and the genocide threshold with technical precision, rather than the generalist diplomatic analysis provided.
- Representative of a country that declined to join South Africa's application: Would have explained the legal and political reasoning of states that assessed the case differently.



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 13:13–13:26

Number: "why they have killed over 25,000 people" / "23,000 by the way I think the number is much more than 2[3,000] because of of the number of people uh laying under the rubble"

Dimensions shown: (a) Absolute number — yes; (b) Proportion — no; (c) Trend — no

Missing context

The figure is presented as established fact. At the time of broadcast (January 2024), the Gaza Health Ministry figure of approximately 23,000 was the primary available source — a source administered by Hamas. This is not disclosed. The distinction between combatant and civilian deaths is not made. The expert's upward revision ("I think the number is much more") is presented as analytical insight without any evidential basis.

Effect

The figure is used to reinforce the genocide framing without the methodological caveats that responsible journalism requires.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 10:54–11:04

Number: "there are more Palestinians living outside the borders of Palestine and are refugees than inside"

Dimensions shown: (a) Absolute claim — yes (no specific number given); (b) Proportion — implied; (c) Trend — no

Missing context

No source is cited for this claim. The figure conflates different categories of Palestinian diaspora (1948 refugees, 1967 displaced persons, voluntary emigration). No verification is offered.

Effect

The claim is used to support the argument that Israel has a policy of forced displacement, without the evidential grounding that would be required in a legal or journalistic context.

Summary: Casualty figures are presented without source attribution or methodological caveats; demographic claims are made without citation. Both are used to reinforce the genocide framing rather than to inform neutral analysis.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

02:44–03:14

Quote

"president erdogan of tur made about Germany it literally set to pre he literally said to his German counterpart um Chancellor um oloff uh that uh you you Germans must get over your genocide guilt that the reason why you're not criticizing Israel is because every time you're going to say something negative about Israel they're going to throw in your face um that you committed genocide um in in the 19 uh in the 1940s"

Technique: Germany's support for Israel is attributed not to a principled legal or political position but to Holocaust guilt — implying that German policy is psychologically compromised rather than rationally grounded. This associates German (and by extension Western) support for Israel with an inability to reason clearly due to historical trauma.

Effect

Delegitimises Western legal and political positions on the ICJ case without engaging their substantive content.

Association 2:

Timestamp

06:16–06:19

Quote

"I actually think America is after Iran"

Technique: US policy in the Red Sea is framed not as a response to Houthi attacks on international shipping but as a pretext for a broader campaign against Iran. This associates US policy with covert imperial aggression rather than with the stated legal basis (freedom of navigation, protection of commercial shipping).

Effect

Frames the US as a bad-faith actor pursuing hidden geopolitical objectives, without evidence.

Summary: Western positions (German, American) are delegitimised through psychological and conspiratorial framing rather than substantive engagement. The associations are presented as analytical insights by a credentialed expert, lending them unwarranted authority.



7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:01–00:47 (Opening — before any analysis)

Content: "South Africa is today set to appear before the international court of justice... they are expected to defend themselves against genocide charges... Israel called the case one of the greatest shows of hypocrisy in history... South Africa presented its genocide case against Israel arguing that Israel has actively pursued the Erasure of the Palestinian people in Gaza"

Timing Effect: The opening frame establishes Israel as the defendant against genocide charges and dismisses Israel's hypocrisy charge in a single subordinate clause. The word "Erasure" (capitalised in transcript) is used before any analysis begins, pre-loading the audience with the genocide framing before the expert appears. Israel's characterisation of the case as "hypocrisy" is introduced and immediately contextually buried by the subsequent framing.

Finding 2:

Position: 15:16–15:40 (Late — near end of broadcast)

Content: "all 15 judges including the president of the of the Court uh the American are political appointees right this thing is going to come down a vote and and I predict a a a split decision"

Timing Effect: The acknowledgement that the ICJ bench is politically composed and that the outcome is uncertain is placed near the end of the broadcast, after 14 minutes of framing that presents South Africa's case as legally sound and morally compelling. This sequencing minimises the impact of the caveat.

Summary: The broadcast's opening frame pre-loads the genocide characterisation before analysis begins; the most significant caveat about the political nature of the ICJ process is placed at the end, after the dominant narrative has been established.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

6/10

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)

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggers from other positions produced no analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:54–05:43

Triggering event: Anthony Blinken's statement describing South Africa's ICJ case as "a distraction"

Reaction: "I'm going to be um uh very critical of America... I find it difficult sometimes to square the actions of Anthony blinken with the rhetoric"

Comparison

Israel's characterisation of the case as "the greatest show of hypocrisy in history" (00:15–00:18) — Reaction: mentioned in passing in the introduction, not subjected to critical analysis; treated as a rhetorical excess rather than a substantive charge requiring engagement.

Asymmetry: Blinken's critical statement triggers extended critical analysis of American foreign policy (approximately 2 minutes). Israel's equally critical statement triggers no comparable analytical engagement. The asymmetry is clear and documentable.

Outrage level: 3/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp 07:29–07:37

Triggering event: Reference to an unnamed Israeli deputy minister's alleged statement about using nuclear weapons against Palestinians

Reaction: Stated as a matter-of-fact illustration of Israeli nuclear policy and hostility toward Palestinians, without outrage but with clear framing as evidence of Israeli extremism.

Comparison

Hamas's 7 October attacks — 1,200 killed, approximately 250 taken hostage — are mentioned only as context for Israeli military action (11:07–11:27), not as an independent atrocity triggering moral assessment.

Asymmetry: An unverified, unattributed statement by an unnamed Israeli official is treated as illustrative of Israeli policy; documented Hamas atrocities are contextualised as understandable responses to oppression. The asymmetry is structural and consistent throughout the broadcast.

Outrage level: 2/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Summary: The broadcast applies critical scrutiny and implicit moral condemnation asymmetrically — Western and Israeli positions are subjected to critical framing while South African and Palestinian positions are treated sympathetically. The 7 October attacks receive no independent moral assessment comparable to the treatment of Israeli military actions.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:01–16:46 (entire broadcast)

Missing perspective/fact: No representative of Israel's legal position is interviewed or given direct voice. Israel's anticipated arguments are previewed by Professor Landsberg but framed as political attack strategies rather than substantive legal defences.

Relevance: The broadcast is explicitly about Day 2 of the ICJ hearings — Israel's day to present its defence. The absence of any direct Israeli voice on the day Israel is presenting its case is a fundamental completeness failure.

Effect

Viewers receive a one-sided preview of Israel's defence, framed by an analyst sympathetic to South Africa, rather than any direct engagement with Israel's legal arguments.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 00:01–16:46

Missing perspective/fact: The legal threshold for genocide under Article II of the Genocide Convention — specifically the requirement to prove specific intent (*dolus specialis*) — is never explained.

Relevance: This is the central legal question in the case. Without it, viewers cannot assess whether South Africa's evidence is legally sufficient or whether the genocide characterisation is legally established.

Effect

The genocide framing is treated as essentially established rather than as a contested legal question, misleading viewers about the state of the legal proceedings.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 00:15–00:18

Missing perspective/fact: Israel's "hypocrisy" charge — including South Africa's relations with Russia, Iran, and Zimbabwe, and its silence on other ongoing conflicts — is introduced but never substantively addressed.

Relevance: This charge was a significant part of Israel's public response to the ICJ case and was widely reported in South African media. It deserved substantive engagement.

Effect

The charge is implicitly dismissed without analysis, leaving viewers without the information needed to assess it.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits the legal threshold for genocide, Israel's substantive defence arguments, and the hypocrisy charge against South Africa — three elements that are central to a complete and balanced account of the ICJ proceedings.

Share of covered perspectives

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

[A] South Africa's legal team: the merits and methodology of the genocide application

[B] Israel's legal and political position: the defence arguments, including the 7 October context and Hamas human shield claims

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

[C] Independent international law experts: neutral assessment of the legal threshold for genocide under the Genocide Convention

[D] Domestic South African political opposition: DA, FF+ perspectives on the case and South Africa's standing

[E] Palestinian civilian perspective: lived experience in Gaza

[F] Israeli civilian perspective: lived experience of 7 October and ongoing security threats

[G] Hamas's role and the legal/political complications it creates for South Africa's case

[H] The ICJ's institutional limitations: enforceability, political composition of the bench, historical precedent

[I] Geopolitical context: US, UK, EU positions and their reasoning (not merely dismissed as hypocrisy)

[J] South Africa's own human rights record: the "hypocrisy" charge Israel raised, including South Africa's relations with Russia, Iran, and Zimbabwe

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 10:01–11:27 — Quote: "I think it was methodical it was good it was a good lesson in law for law students to see and how South Africa just just systematically go to the case trying to prove genocide" — Assessment: Addressed but only positively; no critical assessment of weaknesses from a neutral standpoint.

[B] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 11:29–13:34 — Quote: "Israel is really going to go um heavy on South Africa today first thing they're going to make a link between Israel between uh thec historically and Kamas" — Assessment: Israel's anticipated defence is previewed but framed as a political attack strategy rather than as a legitimate legal argument deserving neutral consideration.

[C] OMITTED

No independent international law expert other than Professor Landsberg (who is not a specialist in international criminal law) is consulted. Professor John Dugard is mentioned by name (13:46) but not interviewed. No neutral legal assessment of the genocide threshold is provided.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: No relevant timestamp — domestic South African political opposition to the ICJ case is entirely absent. The DA's publicly stated concerns are not mentioned.

[E] ANECDOTALLY PRESENT

Timestamp: 10:37–11:04 — Quote: "I do think there is a policy on the part of Israel to to push as many uh Palestinians to the fringes" — Assessment: Palestinian displacement is referenced but as part of the expert's advocacy framing, not as direct testimony or independent reporting.

[F] OMITTED

The Israeli civilian perspective — the 7 October attacks, hostages, security concerns — is mentioned only as an anticipated Israeli legal argument, not as a perspective deserving independent consideration.

[G] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 11:44–12:14 — Quote: "Kamas leaders L standing with South Africa outside the court uh yesterday I think that could have been a bit more sort of you know strategic" — Assessment: Hamas's presence is noted as a tactical problem for South Africa, not as a substantive legal or moral issue.

[H] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 15:16–16:09 — Quote: "all 15 judges including the president of the of the Court uh the American are political appointees right this thing is going to come down a vote" — Assessment: The political composition of the bench is noted, but the ICJ's broader institutional limitations and enforcement mechanisms are not explored.



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

[I] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED — CRITICALLY FRAMED

Timestamp: 04:54–05:43 — Quote: "I find it difficult sometimes to square the actions of Anthony blinken with the rhetoric" — Assessment: US position is addressed but only critically, as evidence of hypocrisy, not as a substantive legal or policy position deserving neutral treatment.

[J] OMITTED

Israel's "hypocrisy" charge against South Africa — including South Africa's relations with Russia (Ukraine), Iran, and Zimbabwe — is mentioned in the introduction (00:15–00:18: "one of the greatest shows of hypocrisy in history") but never substantively engaged. The expert dismisses it implicitly without analysis.

Completeness Score: 3/10

The broadcast addresses the topic almost exclusively from one perspective — South Africa's legal and moral case against Israel. Seven of ten relevant perspectives are either omitted entirely or addressed only in a critically framed, dismissive manner. No independent legal expert, no domestic opposition voice, no Israeli civilian perspective, and no neutral engagement with the hypocrisy charge are included.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:22–00:28
Quote	<i>"South Africa presented its genocide case against Israel arguing that Israel has actively pursued the Erasure of the Palestinian people in Gaza"</i>
Manipulation	The word "Erasure" (with apparent capitalisation) is used in the presenter's introduction — not as a quote from South Africa's legal team but as the broadcaster's own characterisation. This adopts South Africa's legal framing as the broadcast's editorial frame before any analysis begins.
Why problematic	The genocide characterisation is legally contested. Using "Erasure" as a descriptive term in the introduction pre-determines the editorial frame and removes the broadcaster's neutrality.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	03:44–04:12
Quote	<i>"it is almost that they are glad that you had a bold country South Africa of all that took this case so early to the icj"</i>
Manipulation	South Africa's decision to bring the ICJ case is framed as an act of courage ("bold country") that other nations admire but were too intimidated to undertake themselves. This is an advocacy framing, not an analytical one.
Why problematic	The framing presents the ICJ application as a heroic act rather than as a contested political and legal decision. It forecloses critical examination of South Africa's motivations, legal standing, and the domestic political context of the decision.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	11:07–11:27
Quote	<i>"for 75 years right there's been suppression what do you expect people to do at some point they're going to take up arms and they're going to do a 7th of October well I've now just said it so so it's out there"</i>
Manipulation	The 7 October Hamas attacks are framed as an understandable, even predictable, consequence of 75 years of Israeli suppression. The phrase "well I've now just said it so so it's out there" presents this as a courageous truth-telling moment.
Why problematic	This framing contextualises a documented atrocity (1,200 killed, 250 taken hostage) as a rational response to oppression, without any acknowledgement of the independent moral status of the attacks or the suffering of Israeli victims. It is presented as analytical insight rather than as a contested political position.



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

Summary: The broadcast's framing consistently positions South Africa as a heroic actor, Israel as an aggressor, and Western states as hypocritical bystanders. This framing is established in the introduction and reinforced throughout, leaving no editorial space for alternative interpretations.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:25–00:28
Quote	<i>"the Erasure of the Palestinian people in Gaza"</i>
Manipulation	"Erasure" is a term with strong connotations of deliberate, systematic elimination — it goes beyond "killing" or "displacement" and implies intentional destruction of a people. It is used as a descriptive term by the presenter, not as a quote.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "the killing of Palestinian civilians in Gaza" or "Israel's military campaign in Gaza." "Erasure" adopts the most extreme characterisation of Israeli actions as the broadcast's baseline description.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	03:48–03:52
Quote	<i>"a bold country South Africa of all"</i>
Manipulation	"Bold" connotes courage in the face of adversity. "South Africa of all" implies that South Africa's action is surprising and admirable given its relative power.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "South Africa, which brought the application." The loaded language transforms a legal and political decision into an act of moral courage, foreclosing critical examination.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	12:37–12:43
Quote	<i>"creating quote unquote the conditions for a people uh to live in subhuman um um uh um circumstances that could lead to death"</i>
Manipulation	"Subhuman circumstances" is an extremely loaded term. The "quote unquote" marker is applied to "conditions" — not to "subhuman" — suggesting that the expert endorses the "subhuman" characterisation while distancing himself from the specific phrase "conditions."
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "creating conditions of severe deprivation." "Subhuman" is a term with specific historical resonance in genocide discourse and its use without challenge by the presenter reinforces the genocide framing.

Summary: The broadcast's language consistently adopts the most extreme available characterisations of Israeli actions ("Erasure," "subhuman circumstances") while using valorising language for South Africa ("bold"). This linguistic asymmetry is not incidental but structural.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggers from other positions produced no analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:11–04:13

Triggering event: Professor Landsberg makes extended statements framing the ICJ case as evidence of a "divided world" in which the Global South is asserting itself against Western dominance.

Presenter reaction: No challenge, no follow-up question, no request for evidence. The presenter allows the framing to stand unchallenged.

Comparison

At no point in the broadcast does the presenter challenge any of Professor Landsberg's statements, including the unverified claim about the Israeli deputy minister (07:29), the contextualisation of 7 October as understandable (11:07), or the assertion that America is "after Iran" (06:16).

Asymmetry: The presenter's role throughout is facilitative rather than interrogative. No critical follow-up question is asked of the sole guest. This is not merely a soft interview style — it is a structural absence of journalistic challenge on a highly contested topic.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 13:05–13:26

Triggering event: Presenter asks whether Israel can "validly make that claim to substantiate why they have killed over 25,000 people"

Presenter reaction: "so is that something that you know the can they validly make that claim"

Comparison

No equivalent question is asked about whether South Africa can validly make its genocide claim, or whether the casualty figures are reliably sourced.

Asymmetry: The question is framed to invite scepticism about Israel's defence ("can they validly make that claim") while no equivalent sceptical question is directed at South Africa's case. The triggering event (Israel's human shield argument) produces a challenging question; South Africa's genocide argument produces no equivalent challenge.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 01:01–01:08

Triggering event: Introduction of Professor Landsberg

Presenter reaction: "Prof thanks so much uh good to have you in studio so early in the new year but we've hit the ground running all the best for 2024"

Comparison

No comparable warmth or social affirmation is expressed toward any representative of an opposing view — because no such representative is present.

Asymmetry: While social pleasantries are normal in broadcast journalism, the warm, collegial tone established at the outset sets a register of agreement and shared purpose that is maintained throughout the interview, functioning as a structural signal of editorial alignment.



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

Summary: The presenter functions as a facilitator of Professor Landsberg's analysis rather than as an independent journalistic interrogator. No critical follow-up questions are asked; the only challenging question in the broadcast is directed at Israel's anticipated defence, not at South Africa's case.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

To Professor Landsberg (re South Africa's case), 08:42–09:00: "what's your assessment of how they did" — Soft/open

To [Israel — paraphrased by Landsberg], 13:05–13:26: "so is that something that you know the can they validly make that claim to substantiate why they have killed over 25,000 people" — Hard/sceptical

Comparison

South Africa's performance is assessed with an open, inviting question ("how did they do?"). Israel's anticipated defence is assessed with a sceptical, challenging question ("can they validly make that claim?"). The asymmetry is direct and documentable.

Asymmetry 2:

To Professor Landsberg (re US policy), 04:17–04:32: "you look at what's happening now with the United States and uh the UK and what's happening in the Red Sea and there is of course concern as you say uh geopolitically we seemingly becoming more unstable" — Soft, leading, adopts expert's framing

To [no representative of US/UK/Israel present]: No question asked — 0 minutes

Comparison

US/UK policy is introduced with a leading question that adopts the instability framing, inviting further criticism. No question is directed at any representative of the US, UK, or Israeli position because no such representative is present. The structural absence of opposing voices means all questions are directed at a single sympathetic source.

Summary: The broadcast's question structure is asymmetric by design: open, inviting questions for South Africa's position; sceptical, challenging questions for Israel's anticipated defence; no questions at all for any opposing domestic or international perspective.



14. FALSE BALANCE									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 09:57–10:17

Construct: "let me give South Africa Kus I think it was methodical it was good... there are certain things that South Africa did not say that I expected them to say to to reinforce their case"

Analysis

Professor Landsberg offers mild criticism of South Africa's presentation — noting two points he expected them to make but did not. This creates a superficial appearance of balance (the expert is not uncritically praising South Africa). However, the "criticism" is that South Africa did not make its case strongly enough — i.e., the criticism reinforces the underlying pro-South Africa position rather than challenging it. This is a false balance construction: the appearance of critical distance while actually reinforcing the dominant frame.

Summary: The broadcast does not engage in classic false balance (presenting two equally weighted opposing views on a factually settled question). Instead, it uses a mild internal critique of South Africa's legal strategy to create the appearance of analytical balance while maintaining a consistently pro-South Africa editorial position. Score is moderate (3/10) because the false balance is relatively subtle.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: South Africa's ICJ application is treated as self-evidently legitimate, morally justified, and legally sound. The question of whether South Africa should have brought the case, whether it has legal standing, or whether the genocide characterisation is legally appropriate is not on the agenda.

Timestamp

00:44–00:54 — Evidence: "to help us unpack the latest developments and of course South Africa's presentation uh and look at Israel's possible defense today"

Alternative agenda: Whether South Africa's case meets the legal threshold for genocide; whether South Africa's own foreign policy record is consistent with the moral position it is asserting; whether the ICJ is the appropriate forum.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The geopolitical frame of "Global South vs. West" is established as the natural interpretive lens for the ICJ case.

Timestamp

02:00–02:15 — Evidence: "what we seeing is the makings of a divided world I mean um uh no longer are countries of the South scared to speak out against America in particular NATO and the G7"

Alternative agenda: The ICJ case as a legal proceeding governed by the Genocide Convention, independent of geopolitical alignment; the question of whether international law should be applied consistently regardless of geopolitical bloc.

Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting establishes two unexamined premises: that South Africa's case is legitimate and that the conflict is best understood through a Global South vs. West geopolitical frame. Both premises are contested and neither is subjected to critical examination.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1–9): 6.3 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10–15): 6.7 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Expert Selection / Source Selection (Score 8/7):** The broadcast relies on a single expert whose orientation is consistently sympathetic to South Africa's case and critical of Israel and the United States. He is introduced with an institutional title that connotes academic neutrality, but his statements throughout are advocacy-oriented. The structural absence of any opposing expert voice means the entire analytical frame of the broadcast is determined by one perspective.
- 2. Framing / Agenda-Setting (Score 8/8):** The broadcast establishes its editorial frame in the opening seconds — South Africa is pursuing a genocide case against Israel, Israel's response is "hypocrisy" — and maintains this frame throughout. The agenda is set to treat South Africa's case as self-evidently legitimate and the Global South vs. West geopolitical frame as the natural interpretive lens. Neither premise is subjected to critical examination.
- 3. Omission / Completeness (Score 8/8):** Three elements central to a complete account of the ICJ proceedings are systematically absent: the legal threshold for genocide (*dolus specialis*), Israel's substantive defence arguments presented as legitimate legal positions, and the hypocrisy charge against South Africa. These omissions are not incidental — they are the structural conditions that allow the broadcast's dominant frame to remain unchallenged.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

****MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** ** "South Africa's genocide case against Israel is legally sound, morally justified, and represents a courageous act of international leadership."

Technique: Framing + Expert Selection — Delivered through Professor Landsberg's consistently positive assessment of South Africa's legal presentation and the presenter's facilitative questioning.

Evidence: 10:01–10:14, 03:44–04:12

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "Western leaders — particularly Anthony Blinken and the US government — are hypocritical actors whose support for Israel is inconsistent with their stated values."

Technique: Selective Outrage + Guilt by Association — Delivered through extended critical analysis of Blinken's statement and the framing of German policy as psychologically compromised by Holocaust guilt.

Evidence: 04:54–05:43, 02:44–03:14

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "The world is dividing between a courageous Global South asserting international law and a hypocritical West protecting its own interests — and South Africa is leading the Global South."

Technique: Agenda-Setting + Framing — Delivered through the geopolitical frame established early in the broadcast and reinforced throughout.

Evidence: 02:00–02:15, 03:44–04:12

Manipulation Level Classification

Reasoning: With an overall score of 6.5/10, the broadcast falls at the upper boundary of "clear one-sidedness," approaching systematic imbalance. The broadcast presents a highly contested legal and political matter — South Africa's ICJ genocide case against Israel — from a single perspective, without any direct representation of opposing views. The sole expert's advocacy orientation is not disclosed; the legal threshold for genocide is never explained; the 7 October attacks are contextualised as understandable rather than treated as independent atrocities; and the hypocrisy charge against South Africa is introduced and dropped without engagement. Under Broadcasting Act s. 6 and BCCSA Code Clause 18, the broadcast's failure to present opposing views on a controversial matter of significant public importance constitutes a clear departure from the impartiality standard. The broadcast does not reach the threshold of "systematic imbalance" (7–8) because it does not actively misrepresent facts and does acknowledge,



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

however briefly, that Israel will present a defence — but the structural absence of any opposing voice and the consistent advocacy framing place it firmly in the "clear one-sidedness" category.

CONCLUSION

This SABC broadcast covering Day 2 of the ICJ hearings in South Africa v. Israel (January 12, 2024) fails to meet the impartiality and balance standards required by Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6, and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18. The broadcast presents a highly contested legal and political matter — whether Israel is committing genocide in Gaza — from a single perspective, relying exclusively on one expert whose advocacy orientation is not disclosed and whose expertise is adjacent to but not precisely matched with the central legal questions at issue. No representative of Israel's legal position, no domestic South African opposition voice, no independent international law specialist, and no neutral geopolitical analyst is given any direct speaking time. Three elements central to a complete account — the legal threshold for genocide, Israel's substantive defence arguments, and the hypocrisy charge against South Africa — are systematically absent. The broadcast's language ("Erasure," "bold country," "subhuman circumstances"), framing (South Africa as heroic, Israel as aggressor, West as hypocritical), and question structure (open for South Africa, sceptical for Israel) are consistently asymmetric. The overall score of 6.5/10 reflects clear one-sidedness that, while not reaching the threshold of systematic fabrication, represents a material departure from the public broadcaster's statutory obligation to provide fair, accurate, and impartial coverage of controversial matters of public importance.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
3	AIRTIME DISTRIBUTION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
11	WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.3/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.7/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.5/10

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.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Broadcasting Act s. 6)

Assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6

Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6 (SABC Charter) requires significant news and public affairs programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality. BCCSA Code Clause 16 requires news to be reported truthfully, accurately and fairly, in the correct context and in a balanced manner. Clause 18 requires opposing views to be presented on controversial issues of public importance.

Violation 1:

Standard: BCCSA Code Clause 18 — Opposing views on controversial issues of public importance

Conduct: The broadcast covers one of the most controversial international legal proceedings of 2024 — South Africa's genocide case against Israel — without presenting any direct opposing view. Israel's legal position is previewed by a sympathetic analyst as an anticipated political attack strategy, not presented as a substantive legal argument. No Israeli representative, no Western government perspective, and no domestic South African opposition voice is given direct speaking time.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:01–16:46 — the entire broadcast; specifically 11:29–12:14: "Israel is really going to go um heavy on South Africa today first thing they're going to make a link between Israel between uh thec historically and Kamas" — Israel's defence is framed as a political attack, not as a legal argument deserving neutral presentation.

Assessment: This is a direct violation of Clause 18. The ICJ genocide case is unambiguously a "controversial issue of public importance." The broadcast presents only one side of the controversy. The requirement to present opposing views is not satisfied by having a sympathetic analyst preview what the opposing side might say.

Violation 2:

Standard: BCCSA Code Clause 16 — Accurate reporting in the correct context

Conduct: Two significant factual claims are made without primary source citation: (1) an unnamed Israeli deputy minister allegedly advocated using nuclear weapons against Palestinians (07:29–07:37); (2) casualty figures of 23,000–25,000 are cited without disclosing that the source is the Gaza Health Ministry, administered by Hamas (13:13–13:26). Both claims are used to reinforce the genocide framing.

Evidence: Timestamp 07:29–07:37: "the deputy minister in Israel made that point about why don't we just use nuclear weapons and and wipe out uh the the the Palestinians" — no name, no date, no source; Timestamp 13:21–13:26: "I think the number is much more than 2[3,000] because of of the number of people uh laying under the rubble" — upward revision without evidential basis.

Assessment: Presenting unverified, unattributed claims as factual context in a broadcast about a live legal proceeding violates the accuracy and contextual correctness requirements of Clause 16. The nuclear weapons claim in particular — unverified, unattributed, and inflammatory — falls below the standard of truthful and accurate reporting.

Violation 3:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 — Highest standards of journalism, including impartiality

Conduct: The broadcast's framing, language, and expert selection collectively present South Africa's ICJ case as self-evidently legitimate and morally justified, without subjecting it to the critical scrutiny that the highest standards of journalism require. The presenter adopts South Africa's legal framing ("Erasure of the Palestinian people") as the broadcast's own descriptive language. The expert's advocacy orientation is not disclosed. The legal threshold for genocide — the central question in the proceedings — is never explained.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:22–00:28: "South Africa presented its genocide case against Israel arguing that Israel has actively pursued the Erasure of the Palestinian people in Gaza" — presenter's own language, not a quote; Timestamp 10:01–10:14: "I think it was methodical it was good it was a good lesson in law for law students" — unchallenged positive assessment with no critical counterweight.

Assessment: The broadcast fails the impartiality standard of Broadcasting Act s. 6. A public broadcaster covering a live legal proceeding in which the South African government is a party has a heightened obligation to maintain editorial



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

independence from the government's position. The broadcast instead adopts the government's framing, celebrates its legal performance, and presents no critical perspective.

Overall Assessment — Broadcasting Act s. 6

This broadcast materially fails to meet the standards required by Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6, and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18. The three violations identified above are not isolated lapses but reflect a consistent editorial orientation: the broadcast functions as advocacy for South Africa's ICJ case rather than as impartial public affairs journalism. The failure to present opposing views (Clause 18), the use of unverified claims without source attribution (Clause 16), and the adoption of one party's legal framing as the broadcast's own descriptive language (Broadcasting Act s. 6 impartiality standard) collectively constitute a departure from the SABC's statutory mandate that is sufficiently serious to warrant regulatory attention. The fact that the SABC's own government is a party to the proceedings makes the absence of editorial independence particularly significant: the public broadcaster is, in effect, providing uncritical coverage of its own government's legal action, in violation of the independence requirements that are the foundation of public broadcasting's legitimacy.



CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

Professor Chris Landsberg — Head of Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg

1. FUNDING: University of Johannesburg — public university, funded by the South African Department of Higher Education and Training. No direct financial relationship with the ICJ case or the parties to it. However, South African public universities operate within a political environment in which the ANC government's foreign policy positions are broadly mainstream in academic discourse, and institutional incentives do not favour dissent from the government's position on the ICJ case.

2. MANDATE: Professor Landsberg's mandate is diplomacy and foreign policy. This is relevant to the diplomatic and geopolitical dimensions of the ICJ case but does not encompass the central legal questions: the Genocide Convention threshold, the *dolus specialis* requirement, ICJ jurisdictional issues, or international criminal law procedure. His mandate is partially compatible with neutral assessment of diplomatic dimensions; it is not compatible with authoritative legal analysis of the genocide claim.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: No direct financial conflict of interest is identifiable. However, Professor Landsberg's publicly stated positions on South African foreign policy and the Global South are consistently aligned with the ANC government's orientation. His institutional position within a South African public university creates soft incentives to align with the dominant domestic political consensus on the ICJ case. This is a soft conflict of interest — not disqualifying, but requiring disclosure.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6D, -2 to +2):

Dimension	Score	Reasoning
D1 Conflict of Interest	0	No direct financial conflict; soft ideological alignment with ANC foreign policy not disclosed
D2 Personal Risk	+1	Some reputational risk as academic; reduced by dominant domestic consensus supporting ICJ case
D3 Subject Competence	0	Competent in diplomacy/foreign policy; not a specialist in international criminal law or Genocide Convention
D4 Opinion Consistency	+1	Positions consistent with prior public statements
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data	-1	Mix of analytical and advocacy statements; advocacy orientation not distinguished from analysis
D6 Source Level	0	Secondary source — analysing and interpreting primary events
TOTAL	+1	SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

5. COUNTERVOICE: Yes — multiple countervoices exist and are not cited: (a) international criminal law specialists who have publicly assessed the genocide threshold as a high legal bar (e.g., scholars from the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law, or the International Criminal Court bar); (b) South African legal academics who have expressed reservations about the jurisdictional basis of the case; (c) Israeli legal scholars presenting the defence arguments as substantive legal positions. None of these countervoices are cited or acknowledged.

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Head of Diplomacy and Foreign Policy at the University of Johannesburg" is an institutional title, not a substantive qualification for the specific legal questions at the centre of this broadcast. The title connotes academic authority and neutrality; it does not establish expertise in international criminal law, the Genocide



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

Convention, or ICJ procedure. The broadcast's reliance on this title as a credential for authoritative legal analysis is itself a framing technique — it presents institutional status as a substitute for subject-specific expertise.

Analysis completed. All findings are based exclusively on the transcript provided. Direct quotes are reproduced in the original language of the broadcast. Timestamps are as provided in the transcript. This analysis is prepared for purposes of media accountability assessment under Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6, and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18.

Legal and Methodological Notes

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. 6. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular BCCSA).
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 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

South Africa — Legal Framework for Broadcasting Impartiality

Primary Legislation

Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 (as amended)

The Broadcasting Act establishes the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) as a public broadcaster and defines its Charter obligations.

Section 6 — Charter of the Corporation:

The SABC Charter mandates that the public broadcaster must:

- Provide programming that reflects South African attitudes, opinions, ideas, values and artistic creativity
- Offer a plurality of views and a variety of news, information and analysis
- Provide significant news and public affairs programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality

Section 10 — Editorial Independence:

The SABC's news and current affairs programming must be independent from government or political party influence. The Board must ensure editorial policies that safeguard journalistic integrity.

ICASA Act 13 of 2000

The Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA) is the regulatory body responsible for broadcasting licensing and compliance.

Electronic Communications Act 36 of 2005

Provides the overarching regulatory framework for electronic communications, including broadcasting standards.

BCCSA Broadcasting Code of Conduct

The Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA) enforces the Free-to-Air Broadcasting Code of Conduct, which includes:

Clause 16 — News:

- News must be reported truthfully, accurately and fairly
- News must be presented in the correct context and in a balanced manner
- Only verified facts may be presented as facts; opinions must be clearly identified as such

Clause 17 — Comment:

- Comment must be clearly distinguished from fact
- Comment must be an honest expression of opinion and must be presented fairly

Clause 18 — Controversial Issues of Public Importance:

- When a programme deals with a controversial issue of public importance, opposing views must be presented, either within the same programme or in a follow-up programme within a reasonable time
- This requirement applies to all broadcasting services

Clause 20 — Elections:

- During election periods, broadcasters must ensure equitable treatment of all political parties
- ICASA issues specific election broadcasting regulations

Regulatory / Complaints Bodies

Body	Role	Binding?
------	------	----------

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

ICASA (Independent Communications Authority of South Africa)	Licensing, spectrum, compliance enforcement	Yes — can fine, revoke licences
BCCSA (Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa)	Content complaints (bias, fairness, accuracy)	Yes — can reprimand, fine, require corrections
SABC Board	Internal editorial oversight	Internal
Parliament Portfolio Committee on Communications	Political oversight of SABC	Indirect

Notable Enforcement

- May 2024: ICASA fined SABC R500,000 for refusing to broadcast the Democratic Alliance's election advertisement showing a burning South African flag, ruling that SABC violated the right to free political communication.
- 2016: Western Cape High Court ordered removal of COO Hlaudi Motsoeneng for systematic censorship and political interference at SABC.
- 2017: Labour Court ruled that dismissal of the "SABC 8" journalists (who protested censorship of protest footage) was unlawful.

Equivalent to Other Countries

Country	Law	South African Equivalent
CH	Art. 4 RTVG	Broadcasting Act s. 6 (SABC Charter)
SE	Radio- och TV-lagen 5 kap.	BCCSA Code Cl. 16-18
DE	MStV §26	ICASA Act + BCCSA Code
NO	NRK-vedtektene §6	Broadcasting Act s. 10 (Editorial Independence)



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.