

PANGBURN ANALYSIS

DESTINY vs. PLANET PETERSON

Israel-Palestine Debate

PUBLIC RELEASE V2 - FORENSIC FACT-CHECK

Transcript-faithful claim extraction | triple-checked speaker routing | controlled claim ledger | primary-source-first verification | legal-standard precision | logic and rhetoric audit

CONTROLLING RECORD. The supplied source is an 88-page screenshot capture of an automatic YouTube transcript. The debate text appears on pages 1-37; later pages are interface/comments/blank capture. Automatic captions are not treated as independently audio-certified. Speaker attribution is therefore routed conservatively, and uncertain reconstructions are withdrawn rather than scored.

142	67	75	24
AUDITED ENTRIES	DESTINY ATTRIBUTIONS	PLANET PETERSON ATTRIBUTIONS	WITHDRAWN / TRACE ONLY

Verdict distribution

51 SUPPORTED	28 QUALIFIED	21 NOT ESTABLISHED	13 UNSUPPORTED	2 MISLEADING / OVERSTATED	3 FALSE	24 WITHDRAWN
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------	------------	-----------------

Interpretation rule. These counts describe audited propositions, not speaker quality, motive, ideology, or who “won” the debate. FALSE means the defined proposition is contradicted by the identified evidence; UNSUPPORTED and NOT ESTABLISHED do not prove the opposite proposition.

Publication rule. Questions, hypotheticals, quotations of an opponent, and corrupted or ambiguous turns are not silently converted into factual claims. The report preserves traceability while excluding withdrawn reconstructions from misinformation totals.

PUBLIC RELEASE V2 METHODOLOGY & OCTOBER REFRESH

What changed in V2. This edition applies the October 2026 Pangburn methodology to the completed 142-entry audit: transcript-faithful extraction, triple-pass speaker attribution, deduplication, primary-source-first verification, explicit separation of verdict categories, detailed correction text, active search for contrary evidence, legal-status precision, logic analysis, and conservative publication thresholds.

High-impact attribution safeguards carried forward. The routing audit corrects prior synthetic or misassigned propositions, including: the 80,000-deaths/genocide threshold that Destiny explicitly denied; the F-029 child-age fragment routed to Planet Peterson; the F-044 ICC non-party jurisdiction statement routed to Destiny; the F-068 maximal-killing reconstruction withdrawn while preserving Peterson's narrower plausible-deniability reply; and the tunnel-prevalence exchange treated as a question/denial rather than a categorical >50% claim.

Targeted legal-status refresh through 5 October 2026. A fresh check of the ICC Palestine situation page continues to state that the Court may exercise criminal jurisdiction in Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and records the 2024 arrest warrants for Benjamin Netanyahu and Yoav Gallant. The UN Commission of Inquiry's September 2025 genocide conclusion remains an attributed institutional finding, not a final ICJ merits judgment. These checks do not require alteration of the report's core legal distinctions.

F-044 ICC jurisdiction	FALSE for the narrow proposition that ICC jurisdiction is defeated merely because Israel is not a Rome Statute party. Palestine's territorial jurisdiction basis is distinct from Israel's treaty membership.
F-083 U.S. youth firearm age claim	FALSE for the defined 2023 dataset proposition; the stated 95% age characterization is incompatible with the identified data.
F-109 Hamas aid-theft allegation	FALSE for the proposition that the IDF did not publicly allege Hamas aid theft; Israeli authorities did make such allegations. The allegation itself still requires source attribution.
Genocide findings	QUALIFY institutional conclusions carefully. A UN Commission of Inquiry finding is not a final ICJ merits judgment, and legal conclusions must be attributed to the issuing body.
Transcript uncertainty	WITHDRAW unsafe reconstructions rather than attaching a factual verdict to a speaker whose turn is not sufficiently established.

Current-source checks used for this V2 front matter: International Criminal Court, "State of Palestine" situation page; United Nations / Independent International Commission of Inquiry, A/HRC/60/CRP.3 (16 Sept 2025). The complete underlying ledger and source register follow on the next pages.

Report architecture. The pages that follow preserve the full official final audit, including the executive assessment, attribution reconciliation, complete 142-entry ledger, evidence boundaries, logic/inference analysis, appendices, and source register. The 24 September 2026 internal cutoff printed in those legacy pages applies to that underlying ledger; this front matter supplies the 5 October 2026 targeted refresh.

1. Executive assessment

Bottom line. This finalized dossier contains 142 numbered claim entries from the Destiny-Planet Peterson Israel-Palestine debate record. The audit separates supported propositions, qualified propositions, unresolved or insufficiently established claims, contradicted claims, and withdrawn reconstructions. It does not treat every selected entry as an error and does not convert a count of entries into an overall judgment about either speaker.

High-confidence corrections preserved. The final record retains three FALSE findings: F-044 (ICC jurisdiction is not defeated merely because Israel is not a Rome Statute party), F-083 (the defined 2023 U.S. youth-firearm dataset is incompatible with the stated 95% age claim), and F-109 (the IDF did publicly allege Hamas aid theft). It also preserves the many narrower QUALIFIED, NOT ESTABLISHED, UNSUPPORTED and WITHDRAWN findings rather than forcing binary labels.

Legal-status discipline. A UN Commission of Inquiry finding is reported as that institution's finding, not as a final ICJ merits judgment. The ICC's Palestine jurisdiction rulings concern jurisdiction, not criminal guilt. The ICJ's May 2026 order schedules written pleadings through May 2029; it does not schedule a 2029 merits judgment.

No liar finding. FALSE means the defined proposition is contradicted by the identified evidence. It does not mean the speaker knowingly lied. UNSUPPORTED and NOT ESTABLISHED likewise do not establish the logical negation of the claim.

Correction rule. The report does not leave a reader with only a verdict label. Each claim is followed by the clearest defensible factual formulation: the direct correction when the claim is false, the narrower accurate version when it is overstated, the required qualification when it is partly right, or the precise evidentiary limit when the record cannot establish the claim.

Disposition	Destiny	Planet Peterson	Total
SUPPORTED	27	24	51
QUALIFIED	7	21	28
NOT ESTABLISHED	6	15	21
UNSUPPORTED	10	3	13
MISLEADING / OVERSTATED	1	1	2
FALSE	2	1	3
WITHDRAWN	14	10	24
TOTAL	67	75	142

2. Method, scope, and evidentiary rules

Controlling debate record. The supplied screenshot-based YouTube transcript capture controls quote wording and transcript-page locators. Displayed automatic captions are not treated as independently audio-certified.

Speaker-routing firewall. Questions, hypotheticals, quoted objections, moderator/audience material, and unresolved short turns are not silently converted into affirmative claims. Unsafe reconstructions are WITHDRAWN.

Claim precision. Quantifiers, dates, populations, denominators, legal elements and incident identity are treated as part of the proposition. A narrower supported core does not rescue a stronger universal claim.

Evidence hierarchy. Primary legal texts, official statistics, original institutional records and peer-reviewed research are preferred. Military or political statements are evidence that a claim was made, not automatically that the underlying event occurred.

Legal separation. Jurisdiction, provisional measures, commissions of inquiry, criminal allegations, state responsibility, attack-level IHL compliance and final merits judgments are distinct categories.

No source-to-fact shortcut. An allegation by the IDF, Hamas, a government, NGO, news organization, witness or advocacy body is attributed to that source unless independently corroborated.

Current cutoff. Legal/status-sensitive items were refreshed through 24 September 2026. Historical incident findings retain the dates and populations of the sources cited.

No political ranking. Speaker-specific counts are descriptive audit metadata. They are not a recommendation, ideological judgment, electability assessment, or overall ranking of the speakers.

Verdict definitions

FALSE - The defined proposition is contradicted by identified evidence within the stated scope.

UNSUPPORTED - The asserted proposition is stronger than the evidence supplied or available in the audit establishes.

MISLEADING / OVERSTATED - A real factual core is enlarged, a qualifier or denominator is removed, or a conclusion exceeds the evidence.

SUPPORTED - The exact, sufficiently narrow proposition has documented support.

QUALIFIED - A material factual core is supported, but an important limitation must remain attached.

NOT ESTABLISHED - The available record does not resolve the specific event, intent, denominator, feasibility, legal premise or factual proposition.

WITHDRAWN - The reconstructed assertion is not safely supported as an utterance by the assigned speaker and is removed from the error ledger.

3. Attribution and quote-routing reconciliation

Purpose. Before any factual verdict is attached to a person, the statement itself has to survive the speaker-routing audit. This edition therefore reconciles the dedicated 35-ID Routing Audit V2, the later 142-entry publication QA/corrigendum chain, and the explicit user-reviewed speaker corrections that followed.

Legacy routing result. The dedicated routing project reviewed all 35 original composite IDs: 12 were retained with narrowed wording, 8 required a rewritten attribution/proposition, 3 were split into distinct speakers/propositions, 11 were withdrawn as speaker claims, and 1 remained unresolved pending audio. Those dispositions supersede the original V1 speaker labels.

Later explicit route corrections carried into this final edition. F-029 is Planet Peterson, not Destiny; F-044 is routed to Destiny rather than left unresolved; F-068 removes the synthetic universal maximal-killing proposition from Destiny and preserves Peterson's actual conditional plausible-deniability reply; F-085 separates Destiny's safe-shelter hypothetical from Peterson's apparent reply. The remaining WITHDRAWN cards preserve analogous question/hypothetical/stitched-proposition corrections and are excluded from factual-error treatment.

F-005	Routing Audit V2 left the broader 3:54-6:02 boundary unresolved; later context-based review routes the narrower tentative summary to Planet Peterson.	Keep as contextual-only, QUALIFIED; never revive the invented claim that he confidently said Article II contains exactly four statutory acts.
F-029	Inherited ledger attributed the child-age/participation fragment to Destiny; user review corrected the speaker to Planet Peterson.	Planet Peterson QUALIFIED audio still not independently certified.
F-044	Inherited ledger left the ICC/non-party statement unresolved; user review identified Destiny as the speaker.	Destiny FALSE for the narrow jurisdiction proposition; quote-check flag retained.
F-068	The earlier audit wrongly reconstructed a universal maximal-killing rule as Destiny's proposition. The displayed reply about rational actors preserving plausible deniability is Planet Peterson's.	Synthetic rule WITHDRAWN; Peterson's narrower conditional reply preserved separately.
F-085	The mutually agreed safe-shelter wording is Destiny's hypothetical; Peterson appears to answer "They have done that." The old ledger added a no-Hamas-use premise.	Added proposition WITHDRAWN; hypothetical and response kept separate.
F-090 / F-123 / F-124 / F-126	Earlier cards converted an exchange, question, or rhetorical/legal contrast into stand-alone affirmative propositions.	WITHDRAWN as reconstructed speaker claims; narrower legal/factual points handled separately.
F-136-F-139	Tunnel-prevalence/feasibility exchange contained a question, denial, fragmented numbers, and a case-specific discussion that earlier drafts turned into categorical claims.	Unsafe reconstructions WITHDRAWN; no >50% tunnel prevalence or universal every-building rule is attributed.
F-141 / F-142	Final peace-negotiation/resistance turn is partially corrupted and speaker boundaries are not fully audio-certified.	Duplicate universal claim WITHDRAWN; resistance claim remains NOT ESTABLISHED; no hostage-taking advocacy attributed to either speaker.

Complete legacy F01-F35 routing register

The following is the full correction register from the dedicated routing project. It is retained here so no earlier attribution correction can be lost when the 142-entry ledger is excerpted or reformatted. These legacy IDs are traceability IDs and are not a second set of factual-error counts.

F01 | RETAIN | 02:15-02:42; p.2

Planet Peterson: affirmative genocide characterization; Destiny: challenges it.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The record contains different legal characterizations, not a joint factual assertion. Keep each participant's position distinct; the ledger should not compress them into a single "genocide was committed" statement.

F02 | UNRESOLVED | 03:54-06:02; pp.2-3

Do not confidently assign the "four or five" enumeration exchange to Planet Peterson.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The transcript includes "I don't have all four or five memorized" and later a proposed discussion of "four points"; the uncaptured speaker turns and self-qualifying wording do not establish that Peterson asserted that genocide law has only four statutory acts. Withdraw any scored personal error pending audio review.

F03 | RETAIN | 05:06-05:36; p.3

Planet Peterson appears to assert that intent can be inferred from a pattern; Destiny responds with contextual qualifications.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The displayed text discusses an inquiry report and intent established by patterns. Retain as a narrow legal-method proposition, not proof that either speaker conceded the specific-intent conclusion for Gaza.

F04 | RETAIN | 06:36-07:20; p.3

Planet Peterson introduces the 80-83% civilian-casualty estimate; Destiny conditionally acknowledges measurement uncertainty.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Peterson uses "around 80 to 83%"; the response is "It can be. It depends how you're measuring". Do not attribute unconditional endorsement of an exact figure to Destiny or convert a reported estimate into a verified all-period proportion.

F05 | WITHDRAW | 07:20-08:21; pp.3-4

Neither speaker is shown asserting that a ratio alone settles genocide or the lawfulness of every strike.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The passage explores how a numerical ratio should be interpreted alongside other factors. The V1 sentence was the auditor's synthetic inference, not a quote-controlled speaker claim. Keep the general legal explanation outside the personal claim ledger.

F06 | RETAIN | 08:21-08:30; p.4; 38:39-38:56; p.13

Destiny raises a broad civilian-harm-maximization claim about Hamas.

ROUTING CORRECTION: At p.13 Destiny states that Hamas operates "in a way to induce the maximum amount of civilian casualties as possible". Retain that narrower attributed contention; do not substitute a claim that every Hamas action, without exception, had a proved individual motive.

F07 | REWRITE | 08:49-11:31; pp.4-5

Planet Peterson presents the aid-convoy episode and suggests intentional shooting; Destiny contests the particular motive.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The discussion includes a vivid account of people allegedly lured to food aid, but Peterson also says it need not describe every case. V1 improperly promotes a contested hypothesis into "prove soldiers lured civilians for pleasure". Assess the event and motive as separate propositions.

F08 | RETAIN | 10:33-10:55; p.4; 14:00-16:31; pp.5-6

Planet Peterson reports aid-seeker/child shootings; Destiny challenges case details and definitions.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Retain reported incident-specific claims only with their relevant victim, place, time and source. Destiny's requests for ages or shooter information are not independent assertions that the incidents did not happen.

F09 | SPLIT | 11:38-13:53; p.5; 36:43-36:58; p.13

Peterson: journalists have been killed and access is impeded. Destiny: suggests that certain examples might involve a combat function.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Destiny says "usually" and refers to people "thought" to be conducting reconnaissance, not that all journalist deaths were legitimate targets. The V1 joint sentence ("all conducting reconnaissance") is a universal neither speaker clearly asserted.

F10 | RETAIN | 12:02-12:26; p.5

Planet Peterson discusses restrictions on outside journalists entering Gaza.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The location and turn context support Peterson as the proponent. Do not silently attach an unspoken claim that access restrictions prove a particular motive or every journalist's death was intentional.

F11 | SPLIT | 15:37-16:00; p.6; 54:20-57:58; pp.18-20

Destiny discusses under-18 age conventions and potential adolescent combatant status; Peterson probes how that affects mortality descriptions.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The shared summary collapses separate positions. Preserve the distinction between a person's age, direct participation, group affiliation and casualty status; neither person's use of "child" establishes a precise casualty reclassification.

F12 | WITHDRAW | 16:40-18:15; pp.6-7

No verified speaker assertion that *all* child casualties should be discounted.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The exchange asks about possible adolescent fighters and how common they are; it does not supply the claim formulated in V1. Keep demographic uncertainty as an analytical note, not a speaker-attributed factual defect.

F13 | WITHDRAW | 17:45-19:09; pp.7-8; 26:18-26:52; p.9

Destiny argues Hamas operating amid civilians affects Israeli targeting problems; no categorical transfer of all legal liability is established.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The transcript explicitly includes the counterpoint that Hamas's misconduct "doesn't absolve Israel of responsibility" (p.9). V1 invented an "all nearby deaths legally attributable to Hamas" rule and wrongly assigned it to Destiny.

F14 | WITHDRAW | 25:29-27:17; p.9

Peterson expressly says a building over/near a tunnel is *not automatically* a legitimate military target.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Displayed words at about 26:18-26:38 ask whether the building is a military target and answer "not automatically at all"; incidental collapse is then treated as a distinct conditional case. Neither speaker is shown asserting the automatic-target/warning-completes-duty proposition in V1.

F15 | REWRITE | 27:17-28:29; pp.9-10

Destiny advances a hypothetical about remaining voluntarily at a warned military site, *not* a categorical rule that all evacuees who remain lose protection.

ROUTING CORRECTION: He says the situation might be "hazy" if a person expressly remains to aid an opposing military effort. The preceding exchange includes "they don't lose protection" (p.10 top, partly obscured). V1's categorical-loss-of-civilian-protection claim is not faithful to the displayed record.

F16 | REWRITE | 28:38-32:19; pp.10-11

Destiny says he does not know another feasible way to reach a particular tunnel; Peterson suggests troops on the ground.

ROUTING CORRECTION: "I don't know of any" (30:08) is not "no alternative exists". Both debate operational feasibility, and the proposed boots-on-ground option is considered. V1 converts an epistemic admission into an absolute and misrepresents the exchange.

F17 | WITHDRAW | 32:53-34:06; pp.11-12; 40:15-42:22; p.14

Destiny disputes a claim of maximal/indiscriminate civilian killing; he expressly disclaims the proposed genocide-number inference.

ROUTING CORRECTION: At p.14 he says "I never said ... 80,000 isn't enough" and "I'm not even talking about the genocide". V1's "death toll proves genocide could not be occurring" is a contested reconstruction explicitly denied by the purported speaker.

F18 | RETAIN | 34:25-36:31; p.12

Planet Peterson introduces a purported poet/family targeting example.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Keep as an asserted but unidentified incident, with the target and motive unverified. Do not say the transcript supplies a named verified attack file or that Destiny personally endorsed the allegation.

F19 | RETAIN | 37:05-37:24; p.13

Planet Peterson says strikes on March 18 killed about 400 people after a ceasefire period.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The capture explicitly says "March 18th" and "400 people were killed." The 400 figure is a dated claim attributed to Peterson, not a claim that the figure alone decides intent or criminal responsibility.

F20 | WITHDRAW | 38:31-39:40; p.13

Destiny questions Peterson about public condemnation of Hamas and hostage-release demands.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Peterson says he cannot point to such a public statement but believes hostages should be released. Destiny did not explicitly assert the conditional "if he has not condemned Hamas, his assertions about Israel are false." That was the auditor's constructed logical thesis.

F21 | REWRITE | 40:00-42:36; p.14

Destiny argues Israel has not caused the theoretical maximum civilian toll; Peterson says this does not answer his genocide case.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Destiny states "I'm just saying ... Israel is not doing that right now" and adds "I'm not even talking about the genocide." V1 improperly labels "both" as endorsing the inference that non-maximal deaths disprove genocide.

F22 | WITHDRAW | 45:45-46:35; p.16

Both explicitly recognize that one side's violations do not erase the other side's obligations.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The exchange says "Israel, all countries have the obligation" and "when one party fails to act legally, that doesn't absolve another party." V1 attributes precisely the opposite rule to both speakers. This is a substantive quote-context reversal.

F23 | REWRITE | 23:56-24:07; p.9; 28:52-29:16; p.10

Peterson and Destiny discuss the Hind Rajab incident; Destiny describes the killing as inexcusable before asking about the details.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Separate the incident assertion, Destiny's reaction and later questions about evacuation/corridors. The "IDF acknowledged" material in V1 is external evidence, not an additional statement by either debater.

F24 | SPLIT | 51:40-53:39; pp.17-18

Peterson cites a Lavender error-rate/review-time report; Destiny compares the reported rate with a hypothetical human baseline.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Do not attribute to both a categorical assertion that a 10% technical rate and 20-second human review were independently proven specifications. Distinguish attributed reporting, hypothetical comparison and empirical validation.

F25 | REWRITE | 59:07-1:06:58; pp.20-23; 1:46:49-1:47:19; p.35

Destiny presses the distinction between active armed conflict and genocide cases; Peterson argues that war and genocide can coexist.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Destiny's early generalizing rhetoric should be paired with his later acknowledgement that war and genocide can theoretically coexist (p.35). The V1 joint categorical "no genocide can occur during a war / Rwanda was not a civil war" is not a fair stand-alone statement of both positions.

F26 | RETAIN | 1:03:38-1:07:24; pp.22-23

Planet Peterson invokes deprivation of housing, clothing, hygiene and medical care as possible qualifying conditions of life.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The p.22 transcript explicitly lists those conditions. Keep the legal proposition separate from any claim that their occurrence alone proves the required intent in this particular case.

F27 | RETAIN | 1:09:47-1:10:29; p.24

Destiny uses "infinite transparency" rhetorically about IDF-side evidence compared with Hamas-side evidence.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The wording is present and the speaker route is contextually strong. Classify as exaggeration/rhetoric, not a literal measurable promise of complete transparency.

F28 | RETAIN | 1:12:46-1:16:16; pp.25-26

Planet Peterson recounts an alleged early hostage-release proposal involving Qatar; Destiny questions its details.

ROUTING CORRECTION: Preserve the distinction between Peterson's retelling and Destiny's skeptical questions. It is an unverified transaction allegation in the transcript; neither the story's truth nor the speaker's motive is established by this routing audit.

F29 | WITHDRAW | 1:28:20-1:29:05; p.30

Destiny and Peterson discuss possible purposes and justifications of the 2003 Iraq war; neither says it had exactly one objective.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The visible exchange considers weapons of mass destruction and installing a different political order. V1 invented a binary thesis ("only one stated objective" / "same as intent to destroy Iraqis") and assigned it to both speakers.

F30 | REWRITE | 1:31:16-1:31:49; p.31

Destiny points to Israeli aid facilitation as part of an evidentiary objection to the genocide framing.

ROUTING CORRECTION: He does not express an unconditional legal rule that *some* aid makes genocide or collective punishment logically impossible. Preserve the narrower argument and analyze its sufficiency separately.

F31 | REWRITE | 1:35:19-1:41:57; pp.32-34

Peterson argues housing destruction can contribute to genocidal conditions and uses the loose phrase "property genocide"; Destiny challenges the causal/legal inference.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The original summary "destruction of homes alone legally constitutes genocide" was not a faithful stand-alone quote. Split the descriptive destruction claim, possible Article II(c) evidence, rhetorical label and actual specific-intent conclusion.

F32 | RETAIN | 1:38:21-1:38:40; p.33

Planet Peterson relays a contingent debris-clearance model (105 trucks daily; 21 years).

ROUTING CORRECTION: Retain as Peterson's reported projection, not as an independently established completion year or promise. The precise assumptions should be checked against its originating report before the number is published as a fact.

F33 | WITHDRAW | 1:44:19-1:46:25; p.35

Destiny describes post-war conduct as one possible contextual indicator of intent; he explicitly denies that rebuilding is legally necessary.

ROUTING CORRECTION: At about 1:44:19: "it would depend on what the intent and the other ... actions"; at 1:46:25: "We didn't have to go in and rehabilitate it for it not to be a genocide though." V1's categorical rebuilding-disproves-genocide proposition contradicts his explicit qualification.

F34 | WITHDRAW | 1:47:59-1:48:26; p.36

Destiny asks whether a randomly chosen southern-Gaza building is *more than 50%* likely to have a tunnel; Peterson answers that the rate is lower.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The key answer at 1:48:26 is "No ... I think it's less than chance." Neither speaker asserts the claim that more than half of buildings have tunnels. V1 reverses a question-and-denial exchange into an affirmative attributed assertion.

F35 | WITHDRAW | 1:50:42-1:51:11; p.37

Peterson invokes armed resistance while explicitly saying he is not excusing October 7; hostage-taking appears in an interrupted question/rebuttal.

ROUTING CORRECTION: The caption is especially corrupted and the exchange ends abruptly. Do not attribute to Peterson or Destiny a claimed legal right to take hostages on this record. The previous composite claim fused separate turns and ignored the explicit non-excuse qualifier.

4. Current verification refresh - 24 September 2026

F-001 / F-002 - UN genocide finding vs. ICJ merits status

The UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry concluded on 16 September 2025 that Israeli authorities and security forces had committed and were continuing to commit genocide in Gaza, and attributed state responsibility for failure to prevent, commission, and failure to punish. That is the Commission's finding. It is not a final ICJ merits judgment. The ICJ's 21 May 2026 order confirms Israel filed its Counter-Memorial and sets South Africa's Reply for 22 November 2027 and Israel's Rejoinder for 22 May 2029, reserving subsequent procedure. [UNCOI25] [ICJ26]

F-044 - ICC jurisdiction

The ICC stated on 21 November 2024 that Israel's acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction was not required because the Court can exercise jurisdiction on the basis of Palestine's territorial jurisdiction. This supports the final FALSE disposition for the narrow proposition that the ICC does not really apply merely because Israel is not a Rome Statute signatory. [ICC24]

F-083 - U.S. youth firearm-age statistic

Johns Hopkins reports 2,566 firearm deaths among ages 1-17 in 2023: 118 ages 1-4, 116 ages 5-9, 530 ages 10-14, and 1,802 ages 15-17. Even the impossible upper-bound allocation that assigns every 10-14 death to age 14 yields only 90.9% at ages 14-17. The stated 95% figure is therefore incompatible with that defined dataset. [JHU]

F-109 - whether the IDF ever alleged aid theft



On 23 May 2024, IDF spokesperson Daniel Hagari stated that Hamas was "stealing aid from the people of Gaza." This contradicts the literal proposition that the IDF never made such an allegation. It does not establish how much aid Hamas actually diverted. [IDF24]

F-114 - 2029 ICJ date

The ICJ's 21 May 2026 order fixes a Rejoinder deadline of 22 May 2029 and reserves subsequent procedure. A pleading deadline is not a judgment date; the date of a final merits ruling is not established by that order. [ICJ26]

5. Audit distribution - descriptive only

These figures show how the 142 selected entries were finally classified. They are not accuracy percentages, rankings, or verdicts on the speakers as people. The denominator is the set of audited entries, not every sentence uttered in the debate.



6. Complete 142-entry claim ledger

Reading rule. Every audited entry now states the factual bottom line explicitly. FALSE entries give a direct corrected fact. MISLEADING / OVERSTATED entries give the accurate narrower fact. QUALIFIED entries give the accurate version with the necessary qualification attached. UNSUPPORTED and NOT ESTABLISHED entries state what the evidence actually establishes without pretending the opposite has been proven. WITHDRAWN entries correct the attribution or claim construction and are not counted as factual errors.

Each entry preserves the transcript locator, displayed caption fragment, adjacent context, explicit factual correction or accurate formulation, evidence boundary, and supporting evidence where available. Caption text remains subject to the quote-fidelity limit.

F-001 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Allegation that Israel committed or continues to commit gen (institutional findings versus final merits ruling)

LOCATOR: p. 2 | displayed caption clock 2:15-2:31 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"a genocide was committed" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: to make anything personal or like score score points or anything like that with gotchas or anything like that. Um so just kind -- (that. / Sure. And I just wanted to talk about so I do think that a genocide was committed / slash is still being committed um in Gaza by Israel. And I think there's the additional factor of um failing to / prevent genocide and failing to prosecute it as well. Anything you like uh right off the bat?

ACCURATE VERSION: A United Nations inquiry issued a genocide finding concerning Gaza in 2025. This is an attributed institutional finding, not a final judgment of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in South Africa v. Israel.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The UN Commission of Inquiry's 16 September 2025 report is an attributed institutional finding. It is not a final ICJ merits judgment. Israel filed its Counter-Memorial in March 2026; the ICJ's 21 May 2026 order set South Africa's Reply for 22 November 2027 and Israel's Rejoinder for 22 May 2029, while reserving subsequent procedure. As of 24 September 2026, no final ICJ merits judgment has been issued.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-002 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Allegation of failure to prevent and punish genocide (institut versus final merits ruling)

LOCATOR: p. 2 | displayed caption clock 2:22-2:31 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"failing to prevent genocide and failing to prosecute it" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: slash is still being committed um in Gaza by Israel. And I think there's the additional factor of um failing to / prevent genocide and failing to prosecute it as well. Anything you like uh right off the bat? / I mean I disagree with both those points, but I'm sure we'll get into it.

ACCURATE VERSION: The UN inquiry also attributed failures to prevent and punish genocide to Israeli authorities. Identify the inquiry and date when reporting that conclusion.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Keep the Commission's state-responsibility conclusions distinct from any final ICJ adjudication. The ICJ merits case remains in written proceedings as of 24 September 2026, with the second round of written pleadings scheduled through May 2029.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-003 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

A one-sided war or a war crime is not by itself proof of geno

LOCATOR: p. 2 | displayed caption clock 2:51-3:16 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"it can't be that there's a really bad war" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: I think probably the the biggest angle that I'm going to take here is I think that when we're looking at something like genocide, I think we need to look 281 for a country that is trying to eliminate or or do something disruptive or destructive to a group of people. And it has to be something more than just a / military operation. It can't be that there's a really bad war that's one-sided in some regards, therefore genocide. Or it can't be that there are / war crimes, therefore genocide. or can't be that there are some actors um that aren't even part of like a military cabinet. You're small churches, you're / Bengivers. Um therefore, genocide, ...

ACCURATE FACT: A severe, one-sided war or documented war crimes do not, by themselves, complete the legal elements of genocide; specific prohibited acts and the requisite group-destructive intent must be considered.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal distinction neither rules out genocide nor resolves the lawfulness of any individual attack. It is not evidence that alleged acts or intent are absent in Gaza.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-004 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

A genocide finding entails the single solution of Jews leaving

LOCATOR: p. 2 | displayed caption clock 3:35-3:46 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"there's only one solution" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Therefore, genocide is a thing that I I try to argue against. Yeah. And then and then more importantly, I guess the reason why I dont like the genocide argument as much is because it feels / like a thought terminating thing where once you've established genocide, there's only one solution and that's for basically all the Jews to leave to leave Israel and then that's like the only way to to actually solve that conflict. / Well, to be clear, that's not my position on what I think should happen there. Um maybe a lot of people you've talked to think that. Me personally, no, / just for the record. So um for a genocide there are essentially four ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Remove the claim that Destiny declared Jewish departure the necessary solution to a genocide finding. The passage presents a conditional argumentative challenge, not this standalone factual assertion.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not reintroduce the withdrawn proposition as a speaker error or count it in comparative findings. If discussing the argument, quote the full question and reply.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-005 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Speaker's tentative four-element summary of genocide; NOT that Article II lists four acts

LOCATOR: p. 2 | displayed caption clock 3:54-4:16 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"essentially four elements to it" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Well, to be clear, that's not my position on what I think should happen there. Um maybe a lot of people you've talked to think that. Me personally, no, / just for the record. So um for a genocide there are essentially four elements to it as far as I understand. / There's um killing, causing harm, which includes not just bodily harm but mental harm, preventing births, and then the uh / intent to destroy or like the destruction of a of a group of people.

ACCURATE VERSION: The speaker appears to give an informal, tentative summary of legal criteria rather than claim that Article II of the Genocide Convention enumerates exactly four prohibited acts.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The Convention contains five enumerated acts. If the full audio shows an actual fixed numerical legal claim, evaluate it separately; do not invent that claim from a tentative paraphrase. Dedicated Routing Audit V2 treated the broader 3:54-6:02 exchange as unresolved pending audio; later context-based reviews route this narrower 3:54-4:16 tentative summary to Planet Peterson. Keep that route explicitly contextual, not voice-certified, and do not present the older four-statutory-acts formulation as his claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-006 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Act and special mental element are separately required

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 4:36-4:58 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"special intent to destroy a group of people" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: can be anything from I don't have all four or five memorized but it's like you can kill a group of people. You can bring about conditions to make their survival impossible. You can um try to 44s_ find a way to uh sterilize them or prevent the production of new children. / Um and then the the men's rhea part is like you have the special intent to destroy a group of people in whole or in part and this is absent like any type of military 488 conflict but yeah that's the do specialis I think so men's rhea is a guilty mind like you know what you're doing uh the / rail one that's the guilty act itself and then there's the intent so intent is I read ...

ACCURATE FACT: Genocide requires a specified prohibited act and the requisite special intent; neither element can substitute for the other.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-007 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Genocidal intent can be inferred from a course of conduct

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 5:15-5:36 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"intent can be established by you know a pattern" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: South Africa case and a couple other things and the uh from what the report says is intent / can be established by you know a pattern of behavior. Nobody nobody's ever said we're going to go do a genocide right now and and that's how we're like oh there they admitted it we got you right. / We would never we would never demand that level of evidence for somebody to say that. Of course. Yeah. / Yes. And you know what a set what some random settler says some just absolutely insane thing. That's not like I that's not part of it because they don't really s4s_ have the power to enact anything except for like the settlers in the West Bank.

ACCURATE FACT: Genocidal intent may be inferred from an assessed pattern of conduct and other evidence, not only an explicit confession.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-008 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

No perpetrator has ever admitted a genocide in advance

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 5:22 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"Nobody nobody's ever said we're going to go do a genocide" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: South Africa case and a couple other things and the uh from what the report says is intent / can be established by you know a pattern of behavior. Nobody nobody's ever said we're going to go do a genocide right now and and that's how we're like oh there they admitted it we got you right. / We would never we would never demand that level of evidence for somebody to say that. Of course. Yeah. / Yes. And you know what a set what some random settler says some just absolutely insane thing. That's not like I that's not part of it because they don't really s4s_ have the power to enact anything except for like the settlers in the West Bank.

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: The record does not establish that the speaker asserted nobody has ever admitted genocidal intent in advance.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-009 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Random settlers' remarks do not automatically establish offi

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 5:39-5:53 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"some random settler says" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: We would never we would never demand that level of evidence for somebody to say that. Of course. Yeah. / Yes. And you know what a set what some random settler says some just absolutely insane thing. That's not like I that's not part of it because they don't really s4s_ have the power to enact anything except for like the settlers in the West Bank. / But I would call that definite cleansing rather than genocide. So I just have like I have my notes here. Um I figured / we could just talk about each of the four points. The killing, preventing births, harm, and destruction. Does that sound okay?

ACCURATE FACT: A private settler's statement does not automatically establish an adopted policy of the Israeli government or armed forces.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-010 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Collective punishment need not equal genocide

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 6:09-6:24 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"that doesn't necessarily mean genocide" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: eliminate a group of people in whole or a part is going to be the thing that elevates a thing to genocide. So like for instance, we can have war crimes. Yep. / But that doesn't like you can have like collective punishment as like a type of war crime, but that doesn't necessarily mean genocide, right? Yeah. But okay. Yeah. / I have that included too. The uh the special intent. Okay. / So if we start with killing, um obviously in a war, you know, civilian casualties happen, a lot of civilian casualties can happen. It's my 64s understanding that it's around 80 to 83% uh civilian casualties. That sounds like a number that you think is reliable.

ACCURATE FACT: Collective punishment and genocide have distinct legal elements; proving one does not automatically prove the other.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-011 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Estimated 80-83% civilian share of Gaza fatalities

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 6:36-7:06 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"around 80 to 83% uh civilian casualties"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: But that doesn't like you can have like collective punishment as like a type of war crime, but that doesn't necessarily mean genocide, right? Yeah. But okay. Yeah. / I have that included too. The uh the special intent. Okay. / So if we start with killing, um obviously in a war, you know, civilian casualties happen, a lot of civilian casualties can happen. It's my 64s understanding that it's around 80 to 83% uh civilian casualties. That sounds like a number that you think is reliable. / It can be. It depends how you're measuring, but yeah. / Okay. That just consistently ever since even the first two months, which were the most brutal in a lot of ways, that was the number that was brought up. And 796 in the report, that's pretty much the number. So, I don't necessarily um well, no, I don't really at all think 72 that that's the kind of number that you would expect in ju in just a quote unquote bad war, right? I don't mean / to put you on the spot, but what kind of number would you think gets us to the point where this is ...

ACCURATE VERSION: An approximately 80-83% civilian share was attributed to a particular dated casualty analysis. State the original analyst, cutoff, inclusion criteria and uncertainty whenever reproducing the figure.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Unknown-status fatalities cannot automatically be assigned to either civilian or combatant categories. This specific estimate is not a verified status determination for every reported death or an enduring rate for the entire war.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: A Guardian / +972 / Local Call investigation reported that a purported May 2025 Israeli military database named about 8,900 fighters dead or probably dead, against approximately 53,000 overall reported deaths. The arithmetic leaves approximately 83% outside that named database; it does not independently establish that each remaining person was a civilian. The IDF disputed the investigation's figures. Source keys for this assessment: [G83] [LAN]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The estimate depends on whether the database missed unnamed fighters, how suspected fighters were classified, the period, completeness of reported deaths, and whether injuries are included. Women and children are not an interchangeable proxy for all civilians.

LOGIC NOTE: The existence of a plausible source for approximately 83% defeats a dismissal of the figure as invented; treating the dataset remainder as conclusively civilian or current for the entire war would exceed the evidence.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-012 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Civilian-casualty share depends on the measurement

LOCATOR: p. 3 | displayed caption clock 6:56 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"It depends how you're measuring" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: So if we start with killing, um obviously in a war, you know, civilian casualties happen, a lot of civilian casualties can happen. It's my 64s understanding that it's around 80 to 83% uh civilian casualties. That sounds like a number that you think is reliable. / It can be. It depends how you're measuring, but yeah. / Okay. That just consistently ever since even the first two months, which were the most brutal in a lot of ways, that was the number that was brought up. And 796 in the report, that's pretty much the number. So, I don't necessarily um well, no, I don't really at all think 72 that that's the kind of number that you would expect in ju ...

ACCURATE FACT: The civilian share of fatalities varies with the casualty dataset, cutoff, classification and method used.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-013 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Civilian harm can vary with the location of legitimate targets

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 7:48-8:13 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"depending upon how embedded the people are" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: with Venezuela I guess right um and let's say that we wanted to take out a bunch of Venezuelan military installations. If I found that we were bombing neighborhoods 787 I don't know I don't even know if a number would factor in there. I would just say why are we attacking neighborhoods? That doesn't see I don't understand any justification whatsoever #05. for just like bombing civilian neighbors there. Whereas like for a densely packed metropolitan area or densely packed city area, I might think that like the / numbers could skew pretty heavily to one side depending upon how embedded the people are in some particular place. So like one instance or ...

ACCURATE FACT: Civilian exposure may vary depending on the location of a military objective and the manner of an attack.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-014 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Literal, universal claim that Hamas maximizes civilian harm t all stages (if audio confirms)

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 8:21 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"at every single stage of combat" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: numbers could skew pretty heavily to one side depending upon how embedded the people are in some particular place. So like one instance or or not one instance but like one issue with Hamas is that / Hamas operates in a way to maximize civilian casualties at every single stage of combat. So that's a thing that I have to factor in when I think of civilian casualties in in Israel. aa1 Yep. So um if we can get into specifics. / So there's the question of incidental deaths and collateral damage. Uh but then I think I I just think that there / mind. So, for example, uh like the flower massacre that occurred um when they let they they let a aid truck ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: Do not publish a universal finding that Hamas maximized civilian suffering throughout all operations without evidence establishing that quantifier and the relevant time period.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Individual cases of military activity near civilians do not show that the organization consistently pursued the strongest possible civilian-harm outcome; verify the precise audio before treating a rhetorical contrast as an empirical universal.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-015 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

A deadly incident occurred at the February 2024 Gaza aid co

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 8:49-9:24 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"the flower massacre" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: So there's the question of incidental deaths and collateral damage. Uh but then I think I just think that there / mind. So, for example, uh like the flower massacre that occurred um when they let they they let a aid truck in #57 and there was flower there. It was at night for some reason and then uh people were fired upon. I don't I don't have an exact number of how many people died / there, but um and then Israel, they changed the story on that. At first, they said no gunshots were fired at all. / Then they said they fired warning shots. o16 Then they said we were targeting somebody. and they they presented a video, but the video well ...

ACCURATE VERSION: The February 2024 Gaza aid-convoy incident involved a mass-casualty event; the causes of individual deaths require specific evidence.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Report the narrow source-backed core together with its actual date, population and important exception; do not silently enlarge it into a universal claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-016 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Israel sequentially altered its account of the aid convoy shoo

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 9:06-9:33 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"then they said they fired warning shots" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: there, but um and then Israel, they changed the story on that. At first, they said no gunshots were fired at all. / Then they said they fired warning shots. o16 Then they said we were targeting somebody. and they they presented a video, but the video well actually they originally claimed there was a stampede / and that's why people died. Um, but then we got reports from the hospitals. Nope, they're riddled with bullet holes. And then there was there was video that they / presented as evidence, but it conveniently left out the middle. It shows people gathering and then it shows the stampede with the part missing in 41 the middle. So that's an ...

ACCURATE VERSION: Accounts and official explanations of the February 2024 convoy incident changed over time; specify the precise statements and dates.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Report the narrow source-backed core together with its actual date, population and important exception; do not silently enlarge it into a universal claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-017 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Hospital bullet-wound reports establish the exact source of deaths

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 9:24-9:41 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"they're riddled with bullet holes" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Then they said they fired warning shots. o16 Then they said we were targeting somebody. and they they presented a video, but the video well actually they originally claimed there was a stampede / and that's why people died. Um, but then we got reports from the hospitals. Nope, they're riddled with bullet holes. And then there was there was video that they / presented as evidence, but it conveniently left out the middle. It shows people gathering and then it shows the stampede with the part missing in 41 the middle. So that's an example of something that I don't think you can make a good case that there was a military objective there. / Sure. So ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Medical accounts of bullet wounds among February 2024 aid-convoy victims support that at least some people sustained gunshot injuries, if those accounts are attributable to that incident.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: These accounts do not independently determine the cause of every death, the shooters in each case or the full death toll. Separate gunfire, crowd crush and vehicle impacts; use incident-specific medical and forensic records.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-018 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Alleged shooting of aid recipients and deliberate cruelty

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 9:49-10:25 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"I think they fired at people"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: What we know is people um went up to give me when I say give me like what do you think in your mind because you're presenting it as a situation of like / unjustifiable civilian murder. So I'm just curious in your mind what do you think is like the most likely story of what happened there. / Uh I think they fired at people just I just think it was a act of abject / cruelty. we've seen, it was actually Americans that did this, but you know the Gaza humanitarian sites, the GHF or / whatever it's called. Um, you saw the video where the guy captured a video of somebody, you know, plunking shots at / people as they walked away and one of them says, "I think I got one of them." Now, those were Americans, but that's just an

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Reports of aid-seeker shootings and possible intentional attacks warrant incident-by-incident review. Identify which event, date, footage and witnesses the speaker is referring to.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A general description of cruelty, an allegation by a witness, or footage from another site cannot establish that named personnel deliberately targeted civilians in this particular event. Do not convert insufficient proof into a finding of falsity.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: HRW investigated multiple 2025 Gaza Humanitarian Foundation aid-site shootings, using witnesses, videos and clinical accounts, and characterized the pattern as unlawful attacks on food seekers. That investigation provides direct evidence that shootings occurred in relevant aid settings; it does not identify every incident invoked in the debate. Source keys for this assessment: [HRW] [IHL]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: Separate the May 2025 GHF setting from the February 2024 flour convoy; these are not the same attack. Contracting firms and Israeli authorities disputed some allegations about their personnel. The precise speaker, clip and location at this debate timestamp remain unspecified. Source keys for this assessment: [HRW] [IHL]

LOGIC NOTE: Evidence that an aid seeker was shot cannot by itself determine whether the shooter fired to harm, warn, disperse or respond to an asserted threat. Evaluate intent from the particular video, orders, position, sequence and witness testimony.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-019 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

GHF contractor video: "I think you got one"

LOCATOR: p. 4 | displayed caption clock 10:33-10:48 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"I think I got one of them"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: cruelty. we've seen, it was actually Americans that did this, but you know the Gaza humanitarian sites, the GHF or / whatever it's called. Um, you saw the video where the guy captured a video of somebody, you know, plunking shots at / people as they walked away and one of them says, "I think I got one of them." Now, those were Americans, but that's just an

ACCURATE VERSION: A video attributed to a Gaza Humanitarian Foundation contractor contains the reported remark about having 'got one'; describe the speaker, provenance and timestamp rather than converting the remark into proof of an actual casualty.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The footage alone does not verify whether anyone was struck, wounded or killed. Resolve who recorded it and the associated incident before making an outcome or command-policy allegation.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: HRW analyzed seven original videos filmed at Site 4. One includes a burst of gunfire followed by a voice saying, "Damn, man, I think you got one," and a response, "Hell yeah, boy." Aguilar said a person in the crowd fell motionless. PBS aired part of the footage and Aguilar's account. Source keys for this assessment: [HRW] [GHF]

LOGIC NOTE: Distinguish an authenticated audible statement and gunfire from the separate factual conclusion that the shooter hit or killed someone. The statement is relevant evidence of apparent attitude, not conclusive evidence of a particular fatality.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-020 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

An individual rogue soldier's unlawful act is not automaticall genocide plan

LOCATOR: p. 5 | displayed caption clock 11:22-11:46 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"Maybe a few individuals chose to take that action" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Yeah. And I mean Yeah. And you agree with what I just said. Do you think that that's like the strongest version of events there that it may not necessarily be that the / reason they did it was to do that, but it it happened. Maybe a few individuals chose to take that action. I don't / think, you know, Netanyahu was on the phone like, "Okay, are they there? Okay, start shooting." I don't think it was something like that. And in this case, / you know, this would be an example of like failure to prosecute, for example, because it can just be, you know, if if a rogue battalion or a soldier or

ACCURATE FACT: Unlawful conduct by an individual soldier does not, without additional evidence, establish a state-level plan or genocidal intent.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

Ledger checkpoint: 20 of 142 entries.

F-021 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Restrictions on foreign journalists and inferred purpose

LOCATOR: p. 5 | displayed caption clock 12:02-12:18 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"unless you're covering something up"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: that is just scream out loud uh like a guilty conscience or trying to cover something up. It's it's also consistent / with, you know, they won't allow journalists in there. Uh if why not let the press in there unless / you're covering something up or if you don't want people to see I mean, don't people complain about how many journalists are killed in there constantly? / Sorry, I don't people complain about like journalists getting killed in active war zones constantly in Gaza? / It's really weird because Yeah, I understand. Sorry, the echo might be the speakers make it hard to hear. / Sure. Aren't there a lot of complaints about journalists being killed in Gaza a lot?

ACCURATE VERSION: Foreign journalists faced significant restrictions on independent access to Gaza. Describe the restrictions and their dates as the factual core.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A rule restricting access does not, without records of decision-making or corroborating communications, demonstrate that its purpose was to hide a particular offense or that every journalist was excluded for the same motive.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: CPJ and international media organizations documented Israel's exclusion of foreign journalists from independent entry into Gaza from 2023 onward, with occasional military-supervised visits. Journalists and editors argued these restrictions impeded independent verification. Source keys for this assessment: [CPJ]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: Israeli authorities have cited security and operational reasons for restrictions. Those explanations do not independently establish their sufficiency; the restriction's existence does not identify every official's motive. Source keys for this assessment: [CPJ]

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-022 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Documented deaths of more than 200 Gaza journalists/medi under CPJ's defined criteria

LOCATOR: p. 5 | displayed caption clock 12:38 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"Over 200" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Sure. Aren't there a lot of complaints about journalists being killed in Gaza a lot? / Yeah. Over 200, but like they've been we've seen them be specifically targeted uh is one of the problems. But / like you think Israel is like picking out people in journalist vests and shooting at them because they're journalists. / Yeah. Um and they have admitted that because they say, "Well, that guy was there on October 7th helping Hamas." quote unquote. They've literally used

ACCURATE VERSION: CPJ reported more than 200 journalist/media-worker deaths using its stated criteria and reporting cutoff; this is not a blanket finding about all victim statuses or causes.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Report the narrow source-backed core together with its actual date, population and important exception; do not silently enlarge it into a universal claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-023 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Documented deliberate targeting of some journalists versus unqualified general-practice assertion

LOCATOR: p. 5 | displayed caption clock 12:46-13:37 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"specifically targeted" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Sure. Aren't there a lot of complaints about journalists being killed in Gaza a lot? / Yeah. Over 200, but like they've been we've seen them be specifically targeted uh is one of the problems. But / like you think Israel is like picking out people in journalist vests and shooting at them because they're journalists. / Yeah. Um and they have admitted that because they say, "Well, that guy was there on October 7th helping Hamas." quote unquote. They've literally used

ACCURATE VERSION: Allegations of deliberate attacks on individual journalists require incident-level evidence; do not infer a universal policy solely from the aggregate total.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Report the narrow source-backed core together with its actual date, population and important exception; do not silently enlarge it into a universal claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-024 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Actual tactical reconnaissance can constitute hostile particip journalist

LOCATOR: p. 5 | displayed caption clock 13:01-13:26 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"that would be recon" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Like a journalist can't take footage of an act like of a of a future combat zone and then return it to an enemy military. / Like you would no longer be a journalist. You would be that would be recon, right? Yeah. But that's that's just a claim. Mhm. / Um and for you know for 200 journalists uh to have done that and there's a pattern of conduct like you know they'll 13.45 they've bombed buildings and leveled them because there's a camera on it and they claim well that's a Hamas camera, right? That's I mean that's a claim but / I don't think that just gives you license to take life like that.

ACCURATE FACT: Actual tactical reconnaissance linked to combat can affect an individual's protection under the applicable law; ordinary reporting alone does not establish such conduct.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-025 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Two hundred journalists performed none of the alleged reco

LOCATOR: p. 5 | displayed caption clock 13:37-14:07 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"for 200 journalists uh to have done that" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Like you would no longer be a journalist. You would be that would be recon, right? Yeah. But that's that's just a claim. Mhm. / Um and for you know for 200 journalists uh to have done that and there's a pattern of conduct like you know they'll 13.45 they've bombed buildings and leveled them because there's a camera on it and they claim well that's a Hamas camera, right? That's I mean that's a claim but / I don't think that just gives you license to take life like that. / Um, I mean, as far as as far as other examples, like there's the flower massacre. They've been repeated. The

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Remove the universal claim that all 200 journalists performed none of the military roles alleged; it was not established as the speaker's assertion.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-026 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Head and upper-body wounds among aid seekers

LOCATOR: p. 6 | displayed caption clock 14:23-14:37 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"they're specifically to the head"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: spraying into a crowd for crowd control, I mean, that's a horrible thing to do, but that's that would produce a random pattern of we would but nobody would ever do that, / right? Nobody sprays into a crowd. You would expect there to be a single shot to the head of somebody who's trying to shoot and kill somebody, right? / Yes. Yeah. And and like they're specifically to the head. So I don't that just seems like wanting killing of / people. Um when we say children, what are the ages that we're talking about and where are these people found? Well, it's going well for the specific cases with the uh / with the food aid that's in uh like an extremely they they bulldoze the earth up and create these banks so they can observe them. It's tightly controlled. / There's very little space in Gaza that's not part of the buffer zone. I think like 75% of Gaza, I'm not sure about

ACCURATE VERSION: Clinicians reported aid seekers with gunshot wounds to heads and upper bodies. Attribute the observations to the clinicians, hospital, date and sampled patients.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Wound location does not by itself establish intentional targeting of heads or prove who fired each shot. Alternative event-specific explanations and the sample denominator must be evaluated.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: MSF reported in an initial Al-Mawasi clinic sample that 11% of gunshot injuries were to the head and neck and 19% to the chest, abdomen or back, while a different distribution site showed more lower-limb wounds. MSF interpreted these anatomical patterns as strongly suggesting intentional targeting. Source keys for this assessment: [MSF] [HRW]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The clinical sample comprises patients reaching particular MSF facilities, not every person shot in Gaza. It does not identify every shooter, establish the denominator for all deaths, or by itself prove an individual shooter's mental state. Source keys for this assessment: [MSF] [HRW]

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-027 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

"Like 75%" of Gaza as a buffer or restricted area

LOCATOR: p. 6 | displayed caption clock 15:04-15:12 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"like 75% of Gaza, I'm not sure"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: people. Um when we say children, what are the ages that we're talking about and where are these people found? Well, it's going well for the specific cases with the uh / with the food aid that's in uh like an extremely they they bulldoze the earth up and create these banks so they can observe them. It's tightly controlled. / There's very little space in Gaza that's not part of the buffer zone. I think like 75% of Gaza, I'm not sure about / today, but has been in a in a buffer zone. So there's just there's almost no space for these people to operate in. So yeah, that's where there I mean the age unquoced crud that got shot in the head was. I don't have access to that. I / just know the people there are regularly reporting this and I just I don't see how kids can be military targets. / What are kids though? What do you mean when you say kids? What are we defining as kids here?

ACCURATE VERSION: A dated analysis reported that approximately three-quarters of Gaza was subject to a combined set of Israeli-controlled corridors, military areas or restricted zones.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not rewrite that analysis as a finding that a single border buffer zone occupied three-quarters of Gaza. Define the categories, mapped date, measurement and possible overlap.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The UN Commission of Inquiry reported that by July 20, 2025 five corridors, an expanded border buffer and newly designated security zones together covered about 278 square kilometres, approximately 75% of Gaza. It separately

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: OCHA displacement-order areas can overlap militarized territory and use a different denominator. The UN findings describe territory and restrictions at particular historical dates, not necessarily identical boundaries at the debate date. Source keys for this assessment: [UN75]

LOGIC NOTE: The approximate 75% number has a specific documented referent. Calling it false because the border buffer alone was smaller would confuse the category; calling the buffer alone 75% would also conflate categories.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-028 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

A person younger than 18 is classified as a child under the C

LOCATOR: p. 6 | displayed caption clock 15:37-15:48 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"anybody under 18" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: What are kids though? What do you mean when you say kids? What are we defining as kids here? / Um, I don't know if the the UN has a standard definition of anybody under 18. 14s Under are we are we going to the Hamas recruits 16 year olds, therefore Well, they do and much younger, but I'm saying like there's a big difference between like a six-year-old and like a 16y old, right? / Uh, yeah. I mean, I'm not saying children to like to I'm not saying that as a PMIC tactic to tug on people's / heartstrings, but like there could be no possible like if you're killing children, then that that's just the end of it, right? It's just we say women and

ACCURATE FACT: The Convention on the Rights of the Child generally defines a child as a person below 18 years of age.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-029 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Child age versus possible combat participation

LOCATOR: p. 6 | displayed caption clock 16:17-16:43 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"I'm not saying children like I'm not saying"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: What are kids though? What do you mean when you say kids? What are we defining as kids here? / Um, I don't know if the the UN has a standard definition of anybody under 18. 14s Under are we are we going to the Hamas recruits 16 year olds, therefore Well, they do and much younger, but I'm saying like there's a big difference between like a six-year-old and like a 16y old, right? / Uh, yeah. I mean, I'm not saying children to like to I'm not saying that as a PMIC tactic to tug on people's / heartstrings, but like there could be no possible like if you're killing children, then that that's just the end of it, right? It's just we say women and / children in these kinds of contexts because we're pretty we're all pretty damn certain that women and children / aren't uh part of the militia or anything like that. So, it's just to it's just to paint a broad brush and

ACCURATE VERSION: A person under 18 is a child for purposes of the Convention on the Rights of the Child; an individual child's direct participation or armed-group function is a separate fact-specific question.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Neither the legal age category nor a hypothetical armed 17-year-old establishes the status of unidentified Gaza casualties. This claim is not a finding that a particular victim was a combatant.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The legally relevant distinction is between being younger than 18 and contemporaneous protected civilian status. Children receive special protections; the fact that a 16- or 17-year-old could participate in hostilities does not establish that any specific child casualty did so. Source keys for this assessment: [CRC] [ICRCD]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A demographic death tally does not independently classify everyone as a combatant or establish that the dead were toddlers. Conversely, the possibility that some minors participated cannot justify imputing participation to unidentified

LOGIC NOTE: The risk is an unsupported transition from a possible category member to the status of an actual victim. The exact concession or denial made in the fragment must be assigned to the right speaker.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-030 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

No Hamas-produced civilian-casualty figure is available

LOCATOR: p. 6 | displayed caption clock 17:00-17:16 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"Why don't we have a number?" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: virtually none of them are taking part in any hostilities or anything like that. Now, yeah, like maybe there are well, not maybe there are, you know, / like 16 year olds that are in Ham, but what percentage of the population is it? Like we we don't have a number. Why don't we have a number? Sorry. / Why don't we have a number? / Um, I don't know why we don't have a number. Couldn't Hamas publish that number?

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Remove the reconstructed absolute assertion that Hamas supplied no casualty figures classified by civilian status; the relevant turn does not establish it.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-031 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Human shielding and hostage-taking are relevant but indepe violations

LOCATOR: p. 7 | displayed caption clock 17:53-18:29 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"human shields at that point" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: gggZies, booby trapping Iswherrr yassetsare =) underneath. It might be opera / places like Alshifa hospital. m only going by the stuff that Amnesty International itself has reported, ignoring even what, the IDF says, but like Hamas does things to induce the / most amount of civilian casualties as well. Yeah. 1786 Yeah, that's true. But in like like the specific cases we're talking about, you can't make a Hamas tunnel argument for a / go for a for a humanitarian site. Are you sure?

ACCURATE FACT: Hostage-taking and use of civilians to shield military objectives require distinct fact-specific legal analyses.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-032 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Not all civilian casualties are necessarily deliberate targetin

LOCATOR: p. 7 | displayed caption clock 19:17-19:46 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"civilian casualties, you know, is not good" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: It's zero. Hamas has done absolutely zero work to ensure that there are any safe zones for humans to exist in that they wont operate militarily out of. Pravigstion ingle safe zone for humans have been has been declared unilaterally by Israel. Sometimes Hamas will operate out of these, sometimes not. But um I agree / that civilian casualty, you know, is is not good. It's in some cases it's tragic. But the idea that Hamas does everything it can to facilitate and to / maximize the amount of civilian casualties and then the onus is on Israel at every single stage to try to reduce them and the only side that ever 1883 gets protested for whatever reason ...

ACCURATE FACT: A civilian killed in a military attack was not necessarily selected as its intended target; assess the actual attack.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-033 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

Amnesty documents armed-group operations in populated G

LOCATOR: p. 7 | displayed caption clock 20:00-20:31 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"Amnesty International said this"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: And you can say, "Well, screw it. We can kill infinite numbers of civilians." But I guess the issue is that when people talk about human shields in Gaza, they talk about this like this is an 1388 exceptional thing that maybe happens occasionally as opposed to the fact that this is just the rule of how Hamas operates in a 24/7 manner in the Gaza / Strip. You don't ever see them dying in uniform because they don't wear uniforms. You see them operating out of a number of civilian areas. They do. / Even Amnesty International has said this. They said it in Protective Edge in 2014, Um they've said it in Castle. / They've said it in I think even in the current conflict people have talked about it. We've seen video footage of like the oe ee et ee ek te

ACCURATE VERSION: Amnesty has reported armed-group launches or weapons storage in densely populated areas during specified conflicts and dates. Identify which report, event and year are meant.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Prior documented practices do not establish that every later allegation is true, that a particular 2026 strike targeted a lawful objective or that an otherwise unlawful attack becomes lawful.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: Amnesty documented Palestinian armed groups storing weapons or launching rockets from residential or populated areas in earlier conflicts and described resulting risks to civilians. In its 2014 Q&A Amnesty expressly distinguished these acts from proof that specific civilians were intentionally used as human shields. Source keys for this assessment: [AM] [AM09] [IHL]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: An earlier ledger marked the claim unsupported because no matching source had been identified. The Amnesty record supplies that narrower historical source but does not verify every purported building, motive or Israeli targeting claim. Source keys for this assessment: [AM] [AM09] [IHL]

LOGIC NOTE: Launching from a populated location, unlawfully using human shields and the legality of an opposing strike are separate propositions. The source supports the first in defined historical periods, not necessarily the latter two.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-034 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

Speaker's approximate "like 74,000" death-count remark ne date

LOCATOR: p. 8 | displayed caption clock 20:37-20:54 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"it's like 74,000" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: We've been told a million times that this is the most densely packed area on the planet when it comes to people. But for some reason, the casualty number, the death number is still around, I / think it's like 74,000. And I just don't know why there wouldn't be so many more civilian deaths if I'm to believe that Israel is trying to genocide a group of people when the enemy combatants are / trying every single thing they can to maximize the amount of civilian death there. So we're like in the abstract 2083 those are all fair arguments. They're fair points but I'm trying to bring up like a few specific examples. I mean, I / just I don't I don't buy ...

ACCURATE VERSION: The reported total of approximately 74,000 fatalities is a dated approximate figure used in the debate, not a person-level civilian/combatant breakdown.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Identify source and cutoff before comparing it with numbers from another date. A total cannot determine who was directly targeted or the legality of each attack.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-035 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Death numbers show that Israel has not been shooting civili indiscriminately

LOCATOR: p. 8 | displayed caption clock 22:19-23:36 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"the civilian death number is 70" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: But again, but I'm just saying that like the argument that we're running with right now is that at these GHF sites, soldiers are indiscriminately shooting at and murdering civilians for the LOL. / It's just epic and based and they just want to kill random civilians, but somehow that civil the death number is 70 is like around 74,000 I think. So if / people are just randomly shooting and killing civilians, that's your argument. / Why isnt that death number so much higher? I feel like it would be so much higher if they're just randomly shooting and killing whatever civilians they see.

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the claim that Destiny asserted aggregate fatality numbers prove the absence of indiscriminate shooting in every incident.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-036 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Aid-site shootings cannot be excused solely by claiming a Ha presence

LOCATOR: p. 8 | displayed caption clock 23:21-23:46 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"legitimate military objective there" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: siege. Uh, at no point has an adequate amount of material ever flowed into Gaza. How is it that we don't have like / a mass starvation event where at least thousands of people if not tens of thousands of people are dying or if it's been I don't know how long have you / would you say that like there's been a cessation of aid into the Gaza Strip that there aren't so many people dying of starvation I guess. / So I am going to I have stuff about starvation. It's just in a different part of this. So I promise we'll talk about it. I'm not like running away from

ACCURATE FACT: Alleged armed-group activity near an aid distribution point does not, by itself, justify attacking civilians there.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-037 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Hind Rajab killing and the 2026 acknowledgment that Israeli on her car

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 24:07-24:30 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"girl that was trapped in the car" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: inexcusable. It seemed like it was that was the poet guy, right? / That was the girl that was trapped in the car. Oh, never mind. Okay. / Yeah. Um uh and attacking you know aid convoys and stuff like that. But and then just so that I understand. So / your explanation for all of these is this was just soldiers decided to just kill people for because they wanted to for no good military reason. They were

ACCURATE VERSION: Any claim about Hind Rajab's killing, the vehicle impacts and a later Israeli acknowledgment must cite the precise statement or investigative record and its date.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Distinguish confirmed firing and forensic assessment from what the military admitted, including the exact wording. Do not project one incident's evidence onto unrelated strikes or independently infer specific intent from a disputed summary.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-038 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

An October 25 2023 apartment strike killed 81 women and c

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 25:29-25:45 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"81 women and children were killed" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: cases like with the food aid, I mean the people they don't have food and so they they swarm the food aid and there are 244s there are gangs in Gaza because that's just what happens when you have societal collapse. And so I can believe that z4s1_ there are some cases where some sort like it's just bedum and warning shots was killed, somebody says something / and that makes the other guys freak out and so they just start firing that on a case-byase basis. I it's not like I / think every single instance has been like definitively genocidal, but it's about how many events like this do we / have and then extrapolating a pattern uh from all of that. ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: The alleged October 25, 2023 apartment strike, 81 deaths and specified women/children breakdown require identification of the exact building, date, and named casualty or investigative record.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not import numbers from a different Gaza attack or treat a date-adjacent incident as the same event. Withhold the exact count unless source and incident match.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-039 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

A tunnel near a civilian building does not automatically mak building targetable

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 26:18-26:38 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"not automatically at all" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: there's a Hamas tunnel and there's a apartment building on top of it or right next to it. Um, is the building now a / legit military target? Well, no, not automatically at all. Now, there is / there is um wiggle room in here. If you directly target the Hamas structure and / incidentally the building collapses, that's not necessarily a war crime.

ACCURATE FACT: A tunnel near or beneath a civilian building does not automatically turn the whole building into a military objective.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-040 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

An incidental building collapse is not automatically a war cri

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 26:32-26:45 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"not necessarily a war crime" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: there is um wiggle room in here. If you directly target the Hamas structure and / incidentally the building collapses, that's not necessarily a war crime. / However, it it is still as bad as Hamas is, that doesn't absolve Israel of / responsibility. The international law is that you have to take every reasonable measure to minimize civilian deaths. So,

ACCURATE FACT: A building's incidental collapse during an attack is not automatically a war crime; the military objective, anticipated harm and precautions matter.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

Ledger checkpoint: 40 of 142 entries.

F-041 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Hamas violations do not absolve Israeli feasible-precaution o

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 26:45-27:00 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"every reasonable measure to minimize civilian deaths" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: However, it is still as bad as Hamas is, that doesn't absolve Israel of / responsibility. The international law is that you have to take every reasonable measure to minimize civilian deaths. So, / does just checking does this real drop leaflets? Mhm. Do they make phone calls? / Yes. And do they do the roof knocking? What was the last one?

ACCURATE FACT: An adversary's violations of the laws of war do not cancel the attacker's own distinction and precaution obligations.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-042 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Leaflets, calls and warnings are sometimes issued

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 27:00-27:17 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"they drop leaflets" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: responsibility. The international law is that you have to take every reasonable measure to minimize civilian deaths. So, / does just checking does this real drop leaflets? Mhm. Do they make phone calls? / Yes. And do they do the roof knocking? What was the last one? / Roof knocking. They drop a bomb sometime. Okay. So, they do take some at least as many as much as we've seen precautions, right? What more precautions do you think they should be taking?

ACCURATE FACT: Israeli forces have in some cases used leaflets, calls or other advance warnings; identify when and where they were actually issued.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-043 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Roof-knocking and civilian notice alone satisfy the law

LOCATOR: p. 9 | displayed caption clock 27:09-27:24 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"they do the roof knocking" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: does just checking does this real drop leaflets? Mhm. Do they make phone calls? / Yes. And do they do the roof knocking? What was the last one? / Roof knocking. They drop a bomb sometime. Okay. So, they do take some at least as many as much as we've seen precautions, right? What more precautions do you think they should be taking?

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the reconstruction that warnings or roof-knocking alone automatically make any subsequent attack lawful.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-044 | Destiny

FALSE

ICC jurisdiction and Israel's non-party status

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 27:42 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"ICC doesn't even really apply here because Israel is not a signator"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Well, I mean, I think sure, maybe there are uh international crime scholars or whatever that that take that position. I think that that's a fringe position. / Well, the if you want to be super technical, the ICC doesn't even really apply here because Israel is not a signator to the Rome Statute, but that's neither here nor there. But I'm saying / that I don't think it's a fringe position to say that if an enemy was invading my country, if China was invading Miami, honestly, they should 2788 just [] destroy Miami. But I'm just kidding. But if they were to if they were to invade Miami and they were to say, just so you know, we know there are soldiers in your apartment complex. / We're going to bomb it. And I were to say, I don't give a [] I'm staying right the [] here. I'm subjecting myself in a way to combat. I know / that I'm serving some kind of function to the military that's here. like it's it becomes a lot at the at the best you could say it becomes hazy but like seas eatietically in a way I'm throwing myself ...

CORRECTED FACT: Israel's non-party status under the Rome Statute does not, by itself, bar ICC jurisdiction over alleged conduct within the ICC's accepted territorial jurisdiction in Palestine.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The ICC's 21 November 2024 chamber decision rejected the proposition that separate Israeli acceptance was required given Palestine's territorial jurisdiction. This is about ICC jurisdiction, not a conviction of the persons named in warrants or an ICJ genocide merits ruling.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: Israel is not a Rome Statute state party. However, Article 12 provides territorial jurisdiction when relevant conduct occurs on the territory of a state party; in February 2021 the ICC Pre-Trial Chamber determined its territorial jurisdiction in the Palestine situation encompasses Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. Source keys for this assessment: [ICC] [ROME]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A jurisdictional ruling does not establish guilt, the legality of any particular operation or which individuals satisfy the elements of a charged crime. Non-party status is legally relevant but does not by itself defeat territorial jurisdiction. Source keys for this assessment: [ICC] [ROME]

LOGIC NOTE: Non-party status is not a sufficient premise for "ICC cannot apply here." The distinction is between an individual state's ratification and the Court's territorial or other jurisdictional bases.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the contradiction only for the expressly defined claim and data scope; preserve any independently supported qualitative point.

F-045 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Civilians who refuse warnings thereby serve a military functi

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 28:13-28:29 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"serving some kind of function to the military" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: We're going to bomb it. And I were to say, I don't give a [] I'm staying right the [] here. I'm subjecting myself in in a way to combat. I know / that I'm serving some kind of function to the military that's here. like it's it becomes a lot at the at the best you could say it becomes hazy but like seas eatietically in a way I'm throwing myself towards the war effort like the reason why I'm here is because I know I'm trying to / it's arguable here in terms of function what I'm serving here it becomes it becomes hazy at best in the abstract I don't disagree with you but I think the / reality of the situation is Gaza is this tiny place and ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the invented rule that civilians who remain after a warning thereby serve a military function.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-046 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Gaza civilians may lack realistic safe destinations

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 28:38-28:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"people don't really have places to go" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: it's arguable here in terms of function what I'm serving here it becomes it becomes hazy at best in the abstract I don't disagree with you but I think the / reality of the situation is Gaza is this tiny place and people dont really have places to go and then they they see that / people get killed even as they're trying to flee and there's a huge population. / Why do they get killed when they're trying to flee though?

ACCURATE FACT: Some displaced Gaza civilians lacked realistic access to safe destinations; evaluate the specified displacement order and available routes.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-047 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

Reported launches from humanitarian routes

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 28:54-29:02 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"Hamas is literally launching attacks from the humanitarian corridors"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: people get killed even as they're trying to flee and there's a huge population. / Why do they get killed when they're trying to flee though? / I sometimes because Hamas is literally launching attacks from the humanitarian corridors, right? Because Hamas will never agree with Israel to actually / family hints family a tank shot up their car with hundreds of rounds from 50 meters away. They were they were told to / evacuate and they tried to evacuate. Um, so like there are people are going to have examples like that or maybe they do have extremely frail and can't move. / Do you think that the targeting is completely random in the Gaza Strip? If Israel says move to Rafa, do you think your chances of dying in Rafa are the

ACCURATE VERSION: Israeli authorities reported rocket launches from or near a route they described as humanitarian. Attribute that as an IDF allegation and specify its incident and date.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: An IDF publication by itself does not independently establish the launch location, timing or any later target's legal status. Geolocated footage and neutral contemporaneous evidence would be needed to certify the incident independently.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: On August 13, 2024 the IDF reported Hamas rocket fire from a designated humanitarian route in Khan Younis and said it subsequently struck adjacent launch-related targets. This is direct evidence that Israel made a specific location-and-conduct allegation. Source keys for this assessment: [IDFCOR]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: An IDF press release alone cannot independently authenticate the launch site, the intended launcher's affiliation or a general pattern across all humanitarian corridors. An alleged November 2023 attack on troops opening a route would not by itself prove fire originated inside that route. Source keys for this assessment: [IDFCOR]

LOGIC NOTE: One documented military allegation is neither a proof of systematic corridor use nor an explanation for civilian harm in another specific incident.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-048 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Hind Rajab car attack: documented firing and impacts; exact distance remains disputed

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 29:02-29:19 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"a tank shot up their car with hundreds of rounds" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: I sometimes because Hamas is literally launching attacks from the humanitarian corridors, right? Because Hamas will never agree with Israel to actually / family hints family a tank shot up their car with hundreds of rounds from 50 meters away. They were they were told to / evacuate and they tried to evacuate. Um, so like there are people are going to have examples like that or maybe they do have extremely frail and can't move. / Do you think that the targeting is completely random in the Gaza Strip? If Israel says move to Rafa, do you think your chances of dying in Rafa are the

ACCURATE VERSION: The attack on Hind Rajab's vehicle, the effects of gunfire and the estimated firing distance should be reported with the individual source and uncertainty.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Report the narrow source-backed core together with its actual date, population and important exception; do not silently enlarge it into a universal claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-049 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

Hamas agreements to designated civilian safe zones

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 29:38-29:54 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
 "Hamas doesn't agree to any humanitarian safe zones"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: same as dying in in what Gaza city or anywhere in the north? Or if Israel says we're moving north from Rafa, do you think your chances of dying in the north are the same as dying in Rafa? / None of this is exculpatory. / Unfortunately, none of it is like hard and fast because Hamas doesn't agree to any humanitarian safe zones. Hamas will never agree with Israel that okay, this / place we won't operate out of and this can be a safe place for civilians. So, what I guess here's my question is from October 7th and onwards, how should 2984 Israel conduct war? Okay, this is what I've been trying to get to. So, we have the tunnel in the building right here. / Can you actually not think of another way to get rid of that tunnel than to drop a 2,000lb bomb into it? / I don't know of any. Can you tell me one? I Sorry.

ACCURATE VERSION: Hamas and Israel accepted geographically defined, temporary humanitarian pauses for the 2024 Gaza polio vaccination campaign; WHO reports that parties respected the initial central-Gaza pause.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A short agreed daily pause is not evidence of an enduring Hamas commitment never to operate militarily within a permanent civilian sanctuary. The broad 'never any designated arrangement' claim and narrow 'no durable demilitarized zone' claim are different and must not be collapsed.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: WHO reports Israel and Hamas accepted geographically defined, nine-hour daily pauses for the September 2024 polio campaign; WHO stated the initial central-Gaza phase was respected. Qatar documented humanitarian pauses in November 2023 and a broader ceasefire agreement in January 2025. Source keys for this assessment: [WHO1] [WHO2] [QAT] [QAT25]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: Temporary localized pauses do not establish a durable, mutually recognized civilian sanctuary with an ongoing commitment by Hamas never to operate there. Conversely, they are a counterexample to "Hamas has agreed to no geographic humanitarian protection of any kind." Source keys for this assessment: [WHO1] [WHO2] [QAT] [QAT25]

LOGIC NOTE: An agreement's temporal scope, boundaries and military-use restrictions control its relevance. A pause is not automatically a standing demilitarized zone; absence of an identified standing zone does not establish no such agreement ever existed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-050 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

A 2,000-pound bomb was unnecessary for the specific allege

LOCATOR: p. 10 | displayed caption clock 30:01-30:16 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
 "another way to get rid of that tunnel" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: place we won't operate out of and this can be a safe place for civilians. So, what I guess here's my question is from October 7th and onwards, how should 2984 Israel conduct war? Okay, this is what I've been trying to get to. So, we have the tunnel in the building right here. / Can you actually not think of another way to get rid of that tunnel than to drop a 2,000lb bomb into it? / I don't know of any. Can you tell me one? I Sorry. / I'm I don't know of any other way to do it. No. Can you tell me one?

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: There is no adequate operational record here to determine whether a smaller weapon or alternative tactic could neutralize the particular alleged tunnel or other underground objective.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Ask for the target dossier, bomb type/fuze, location, alternatives and expected civilian effects. Neither the mere existence of smaller weapons nor an IDF assertion of necessity proves what was feasible in that particular strike.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-051 | Destiny

NOT ESTABLISHED

A small special-forces insertion in the proposed Gaza scenari

LOCATOR: p. 11 | displayed caption clock 30:27-31:10 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
 "That's never happened ever"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: But do you not think that that can't can any operation become a halfway failed operation? Do you think it's realistic to just send the IDF into a heavily / populated civilian populated area densely populated where there could be enemy combatants? They have all countries have /

the obligation to take every reasonable precaution. Can you think of a single country in single in a single conflict in all of human history where a country has opted to do that? as7_ Where they've opted to do that? Yeah. That's never happened ever. / When we invaded Iraq, which was horrendous for Mosul, we dropped leaflets and we gave warnings to the civilians and then we went in and we bombed the [_] out of anybody that was left there was basically considered an enemy combatant. / We did not say everybody can stay home and everything is chill and cool and we're just going to walk in and we're just naina ¢- tha knock on doors and see who's there. Like I mean I've avy usvened to people that serve say very differently like uh Jaco Willick or whatever ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Historic special-forces raids establish that such operations are sometimes possible, but the specific proposed Gaza insertion cannot be adjudicated without its objectives and operating conditions.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The claim should not be recast as 'no army has ever sent ground forces first.' Require force size, adversary, terrain, intelligence, extraction and civilian-risk assessment before saying the proposed raid was feasible or impossible.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The 2011 bin Laden raid and Israeli targeted raids demonstrate that special operations against defended objectives exist. They vary materially in force size, target intelligence, support, extraction, enemy density and the civilian population at risk. Source keys for this assessment: [CIA] [IHL2]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: No operational dossier identifies the exact target, defending force, proposed raid method or alternative means in the Gaza case under debate. Historical existence does not prove feasibility for this target; the danger of urban combat does not prove categorical impossibility.

LOGIC NOTE: Compare cases on operationally material dimensions rather than merely citing that a raid occurred. A "never" claim must preserve its stated conditions before historical counterexamples can adjudicate it.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-052 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

US forces used advance warnings in the Mosul operation

LOCATOR: p. 11 | displayed caption clock 31:01-31:10 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"we dropped leaflets and we gave warnings" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: the obligation to take every reasonable precaution. Can you think of a single country in single in a single conflict in all of human history where a country has opted to do that? as7_ Where they've opted to do that? Yeah. That's never happened ever. / When we invaded Iraq, which was horrendous for Mosul, we dropped leaflets and we gave warnings to the civilians and then we went in and we bombed the [_] out of anybody that was left there was basically considered an enemy combatant. / We did not say everybody can stay home and everything is chill and cool and we're just going to walk in and we're just naina ¢- tha knock on doors and see who's ...

ACCURATE FACT: U.S. forces used certain warning measures during the battle for Mosul; their extent and practical effectiveness varied by operation.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-053 | Destiny

NOT ESTABLISHED

Bin Laden raid analogy in a multi-target Gaza battle

LOCATOR: p. 11 | displayed caption clock 31:40-32:12 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"not a possible thing to do"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: a military expert. He's been in these situations really early on that I don't know if you listen to anything he says, but really early on in the conflict, he / looked at this and he said, "No, this is just this is not." So, you just really are saying it's just not reasonable to. 3140_ I'm saying that no sane human being is going to tell you that you can just send super special ops marines in that are capable of fending off thousands of aie enemy combatants and then getting the bad guys or saving the good guys and and escaping unscathed. This type of military operation that you're describing has never happened in the / history of all of humanity and probably will never happen in all of humanity's future. It is not a possible thing to do. No, I mean we just are going to have to agree to disagree on that. / But to be clear, there's no historical example that you can give that is even remotely comparable to the type of operation that you're suggesting. / That's not what I that's not the thing I was talking about. Yes, Gaza is ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: The bin Laden raid was a particular operation in Pakistan; it is not a like-for-like operational test of a multi-target mission in populated Gaza.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not infer either feasibility or impossibility of the Gaza proposal solely from the historical raid. Specify the actual proposed mission and the military and civilian constraints.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: CIA's account records a highly prepared, intelligence-intensive raid on one Abbottabad compound in May 2011. It was not an urban offensive against a large, organized force defending numerous objectives; the United States was not at war with Pakistan's armed forces. Source keys for this assessment: [CIA] [IHL2]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The Abbottabad example does demonstrate that ground assault can be selected rather than a standoff strike. It does not establish that the proposed Gaza target was reachable, that a similarly small unit could accomplish the mission, or that casualties would have been lower.

LOGIC NOTE: Peterson's analogy identifies a possible military method; Destiny identifies meaningful differences in circumstances. Neither proposition supplies the missing Gaza operation record, so a categorical impossibility finding remains premature.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-054 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

The bin Laden raid occurred in Pakistan without a US-Pakist

LOCATOR: p. 11 | dislaved caption clock 32:27-32:52 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"we weren't at war with Pakistan" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: How do we kill Bin Laden? / Well, that we weren't at war. That was an actual like we weren't at war with Pakistan when we went in to get bin Laden out of a compound, right? / I mean, would you kill 20 random people to get bin Laden? We knew what building he was in. seas Yeah. But I'm saying that like all of Pakistan was not on alert for a US I don't know if it was a Blackhawk whatever helicopter mission came in. / Like we weren't at war with the country.

ACCURATE FACT: The U.S. raid on Osama bin Laden occurred in Pakistan; its diplomatic and military circumstances differ from the Gaza proposal.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-055 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Approximate quarter-mile lethal range of a 2,000-pound bom

LOCATOR: p. 12 | dislaved caption clock 33:22-33:34 | contextual routing only | dislaved automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"quarter mile lethal radius"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: You're just telling me there's no realistic option other than to drop the bombs that have like a quarter mile lethal radius. / Quarter mile lethal radius. People dead. / Well, a lot of them are dropped on buildings. That's like the theoretical limit. / Okay. There are very few people dead given the claims of carpet bombing and indiscriminate destruction and death and mass genocide. It seems like of two

ACCURATE VERSION: A roughly quarter-mile range has been discussed for potential lethal fragmentation from a 2,000-pound class bomb, but it is not a fixed circle in which every person necessarily dies.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The source figure depends on model, munition, fuze and exposure, and a reported 360-m potential fragmentation radius is only approximately a quarter-mile. The transcript/audio must establish which speaker asserted the measurement and whether it was conditional.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: A 2024 peer-reviewed Mk 84 study uses a 360-metre potential lethal fragmentation range for a 2,000-pound bomb. A quarter-mile is about 402 metres: a loose approximation rather than an exact equivalence. It is not a measured probability of death for each person within that distance. Source keys for this assessment: [PLOS] [AF]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: Weapon type, fuze, detonation site, shelter, fragmentation pattern and definition of "lethal" change the threat area. A person can survive close to a strike or be struck by a fragment farther away; a general estimate cannot determine deaths at a specific site. Source keys for this assessment: [PLOS] [AF]

LOGIC NOTE: Reject the strong version "every 2,000-pound munition has a fixed, uniformly fatal 402-metre radius." Do not charge the speaker with that stronger assertion when the actual quote is approximate.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-056 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Mortality total and allegations of indiscriminate bombing

LOCATOR: p. 12 | displayed caption clock 33:38-34:04 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"if they're indiscriminately bombing"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: million people there'd be far more than 70 some thousand dead, right? If that was really what we thought they were doing. / Do you really think that that's what the that the number doesn't go higher than that? Might go to 80,000. 3387 That's just positively identified people. 3389 Sure. And I think some people the upper bound estimate for bodies in the rubble is 10,000. So maybe maybe I say 85,000. / Even that seems really low if they're indiscriminately bombing and just trying to destroy and kill as much as possible. / Well I mean, it's hardly like uh just Killing people is the only element of it. I mean, it's one part. It's the part we've been / time. Um I don't know on this specific part we might be kind of at an impass. I did I have a few other details about it / though. So um like for example they there was this poet I don't remember his name uh he was

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: The observed casualty total may be compared with a well-defined maximal-killing hypothesis only after establishing that hypothesis's predicted toll and the same population, period and fatality category.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The tally alone does not determine whether particular attacks were indiscriminate, disproportionate or deliberately targeted civilians. This repeats the quantitative-model concern developed in F-087; avoid counting the same missing premise twice.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The Lancet Global Health household survey estimated 75,200 violent deaths through January 5, 2025 (95% CI 63,600-86,800), showing the importance of data source, cutoff and undercount. This historical estimate is not the death toll for the September 2026 debate. Source keys for this assessment: [LAN] [OHCHR] [IHL]

LOGIC NOTE: A lower count could count against a specific defensible maximum-killing model, but it cannot independently rule out attacks violating distinction, proportionality or precautions. Avoid concluding either that every strike was lawful or that aggregate mortality alone proves the opposite.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-057 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Context-dependent upper-bound claim about people missing beneath rubble

LOCATOR: p. 12 | displayed caption clock 33:59 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"upper bound estimate for bodies in the rubble is 10,000" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: million people there'd be far more than 70 some thousand dead, right? If that was really what we thought they were doing. / Do you really think that that's what the that the number doesn't go higher than that? Might go to 80,000. 3387 That's just positively identified people. 3389 Sure. And I think some people the upper bound estimate for bodies in the rubble is 10,000. So maybe maybe I say 85,000. / Even that seems really low if they're indiscriminately bombing and just trying to destroy and kill as much as possible. / Well I mean, it's hardly like uh just Killing people is the only element of it. I mean, it's one part. It's the part we've been

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: No reliable upper bound on people missing or dead under rubble follows from an unqualified single-number statement without a dated identification and recovery method.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Separate confirmed fatalities from missing people, estimated unrecovered deaths and persons later found alive. The claim requires a date-matched data source and uncertainty range.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-058 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

An Israeli airstrike deliberately targeted a poet and killed hi

LOCATOR: p. 12 | displayed caption clock 34:25-34:57 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"killed by Israel early on" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: though. So um like for example they there was this poet I don't remember his name uh he was / killed by Israel early on he was actually Killed in his apartment building. It was a It was a multi-story apartment building and he was on I think 344s he was on the second floor and they had the means and the technology and the surveillance, we'll talk about that next 3482 to hit his apartment. Uh killed him and his entire family, I'm pretty sure, but 3487. uh nobody else right now. They have the technology and the ability to do that. / But then ub like in uh that uh refugee camp really early Jamba Jambila or something like that. That was the one / , ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Refaat Alareer and relatives died in an Israeli strike on the building where they were staying; the exact selection of target and the claimed deliberate targeting of the poet require direct incident evidence.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Distinguish his death, site and reported circumstances from unverified operational intent. A survivor's account, strike record or official explanation may bear on motive but is not interchangeable with proof of it.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-059 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

An Israeli strike hit Jabalia camp in late October 2023

LOCATOR: p. 12 | displayed caption clock 35:04-35:27 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"it was on Halloween in uh 2023" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: But then uh like in uh that uh refugee camp really early Jamba Jambila or something like that. That was the one / , where it was really early on. It was in October. It was on Halloween in uh 2023. / Uh a spokesperson came on CNN and Wolf Blitzer talked to him. That's the photo with the huge crater. Do you know what I'm talking about? Do you remember this incident? / That's not the hospital that you're talking about, right? Al No, it was a it was a refugee camp. It's called Jambila. Okay.

ACCURATE FACT: An Israeli strike hit the Jabalia refugee camp area in late October 2023; an incident-specific review is still required for target and effects.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-060 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Refaat Alareer apartment strike and precision alternatives

LOCATOR: p. 12 | displayed caption clock 35:41-36:20 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"they have the technology and the ability to do that"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Uh a spokesperson came on CNN and Wolf Blitzer talked to him. That's the photo with the huge crater. Do you know what I'm talking about? Do you remember this incident? / That's not the hospital that you're talking about, right? Al No, it was a it was a refugee camp. It's called Jambila. Okay. / And I don't know if I'm saying that correctly. Sorry. I don't know. That's right. 3sa1_ Um um so we know that they have the technology uh both with the kinds of / munitions they use and both with the surveillance technology to pinpoint uh kill certain targets. Now, while you're 3587 killing a poet, I think that that's an extremely dis that I think that's part of the the uh causing harm. That's part of the mental harm. / So, just to be clear, your thought process there is they knew the pope was living there. They wanted to target just him and to kill just him and his family with a \$400,000 munition targeted especially just for him and his family. / They have that ability. Yeah.

ACCURATE VERSION: The reported concentrated strike on Refaat Alareer's apartment does not establish that precision targeting could achieve every different operational objective without collateral deaths.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Accounts report a neighbouring death; do not describe this event as an apartment strike killing no one beyond the family. Weapon, target intelligence and alternatives for the separate Jabalia strike remain unverified.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: Euro-Med Monitor's eyewitness/family investigation reported that the impact was concentrated on the apartment where Alareer sheltered. The reported dead included Alareer, relatives and a neighbour; thus a claim that nobody outside the family died is contradicted by that source. Source keys for this assessment: [EURO] [IDFJ] [IHL2]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: An apparently localized impact establishes neither the precise munition nor the selected target or motive of the attacking force. The ability to strike one above-ground apartment does not prove that the same method could neutralize a specified underground tunnel objective elsewhere. Source keys for this assessment: [EURO] [IDFJ] [IHL2]

LOGIC NOTE: Preserve three different issues: observed distribution of damage, the planners' targeting intention, and whether a different weapon or method was feasible for Jabalia. Evidence for one is not proof of the others.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

Ledger checkpoint: 60 of 142 entries.

F-061 | Destiny

NOT ESTABLISHED

Journalists allegedly conducting Hamas reconnaissance

LOCATOR: p. 13 | displayed caption clock 36:43-37:03 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"these journalists were serving as reconnaissance"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: I think generally when we say bragged about killing a journalist or whatever, usually what they're talking about is they didn't think the person was a journalist. They thought they were serving a combat function. So like in / the beginning examples you brought up that they were saying that uh these journalists were serving as reconnaissance. That doesn't mean they're bragging about murdering journalists. They're saying that they're / killing people that are serving a combat function for Hamas. Right.

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: The IDF has alleged that specific journalists held militant roles; claims that the journalists under discussion actually performed tactical reconnaissance need identified individuals and independent evidence of their conduct.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Ordinary journalism, affiliation allegations and reconnaissance directly linked to hostilities are distinct. Do not automatically infer loss of civilian protection or legality of an attack from a reported affiliation.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The ICRC distinguishes ordinary journalism or filming from transmitting tactical targeting intelligence for a specific attack, which can amount to direct participation in hostilities. This conditional rule does not establish that any named journalist actually provided such intelligence. Source keys for this assessment: [ICRCJ] [ICRCD]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The IDF has alleged military affiliations concerning specific journalists; those official accusations require evidence of individual status and conduct. Media employment, proximity to a battle, filming military activity and a military allegation are not interchangeable with tactical reconnaissance. Source keys for this assessment: [ICRCJ] [ICRCD]

LOGIC NOTE: Conditional legal possibility must not be used to affirm an unverified allegation about identifiable people. Likewise a public IDF justification is not itself proof of the underlying military function.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-062 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Hundreds were killed when Israel resumed attacks in March

LOCATOR: p. 13 | displayed caption clock 37:05-37:17 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"400 people were killed" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: So like another specific example uh on March 18th. This is actually when there was a ceasefire still in place ... they did a bunch of strikes and 400 people were killed.

ACCURATE FACT: Large numbers of fatalities were reported when Israel resumed major Gaza strikes in March 2025; state the original dated source and cutoff.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-063 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Qualified media quotation about IDF emphasis on damage, i IDF's subsequent translation objection

LOCATOR: p. 13 | displayed caption clock 38:16 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"maximum damage, not precision" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Like he literally said, We are interested in what causes maximum damage, not precision early on. And so I just do not think that this is really excusable conduct.

ACCURATE VERSION: Attribute reported remarks about emphasizing damage to the exact speaker, recording, translation and later objections to translation.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A contested media quotation cannot establish a universal targeting policy without underlying directives and operational evidence. Do not erase the original quote or ignore a documented translation dispute.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-064 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Violations of IHL can exist without proving genocide

LOCATOR: p. 13 | displayed caption clock 38:31-38:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"some of these things rise to the level of war crimes" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: So I can grant literally every single thing you say and none of that actually moves us to genocide. I would argue that there are or taking your arguments, I could say possibly some of these things rise to the level of war crimes. It is possible.

ACCURATE FACT: Violations of international humanitarian law and the special-intent crime of genocide are distinct legal questions.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-065 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Hamas maximizes civilian casualties in all Gaza operations

LOCATOR: p. 13 | displayed caption clock 38:47-38:56 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"maximum amount of civilian casualties as possible" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: That Hamas operates in a way to induce the maximum amount of civilian casualties as possible. Nobody in the west seems to have anything to say about this.

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: The speaker's statement about Hamas maximizing civilian casualties should be reported as an allegation about a proposed military strategy, not as a verified universal fact across all operations.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The present record does not contain an operation-by-operation denominator or documented strategic direction proving maximum possible civilian harm. Check the exact audio scope before attributing the universal quantifier.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-066 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Hamas retains responsibility for hostage taking irrespective military violations

LOCATOR: p. 13 | displayed caption clock 39:10-39:40 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"still holding it hostages" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: They are the ones that are still holding hostages despite the fact that Israel is at war with them and supposedly genocide is going on.

ACCURATE FACT: Hamas remains responsible for unlawful hostage-taking irrespective of any violations by opposing forces.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-067 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Israel could theoretically cause greater civilian deaths than r

LOCATOR: p. 14 | displayed caption clock 40:00-40:30 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"they could have killed more" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Well, you think that you think that Israel could have only killed 80,000 people at this point. / You don't think they could have killed more? Yes, they could have. / Then they haven't operated in a way that induces the maximum amount of civilian casualties. Right. They're

limiting it for some reason. Now, you can argue that they're genocide only if they need. 40.15. I never said it's a genocide only. 'm saying that Hamas operates in a way to maximize. / You said 80,000. You effectively said 80,000 isn't enough cuz it could.

ACCURATE FACT: Israel's theoretical capacity to cause higher civilian fatalities is not proof that every observed attack was discriminating or lawful.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-068 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Plausible deniability in a genocide hypothetical

LOCATOR: p. 14 | displayed caption clock 40:45-41:10 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"no rational actor even if they were engaging um in a genocide"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: not true. How is that true? Because they could have killed more. Right. oe sign 77 €xPlaining it for the last 20 minutes. The highest attack you said was 400 dead people. Gaza has a population of poewige° ow is this the maximum amount of civilian casualties? / Uh as if as if 400 is the only is the number that's let's say that tomorrow you became the if you became the dictator of Israel. If 40:3 I was the dictator of Israel, I want to kill the most amount of Palestinians possible. Do you think that after 2 years my kill count would be 80,000? / it. You know that they no rational actor even if they were engaging um in a genocide like this for the most / part at le Israel's special because they're you know they have a special relationship with us and they are surrounded by hostiles um they would / conduct themselves in a way that provides for you know like a kind of plausible deniability. / Did Hamas on October 7th operate in a way that provided for plausible deniability?

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the former attribution of a universal 'genocidal actors always kill the maximum possible number' rule to Destiny. Peterson introduces a conditional argument about rational actors maintaining plausible deniability.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The conditional possibility of restrained conduct for strategic reasons is not evidence that a particular state adopted that intent. Preserve the actual speaker turn instead of reassigning the withdrawn proposition.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: Peterson proposes that an actor committing genocide might temper or conceal violence to preserve foreign support or plausible deniability. Article II of the Genocide Convention does not require perpetrators to kill at a theoretical maximum or employ the most efficient means. Source keys for this assessment: [GEN] [KRST]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A plausible concealment explanation does not independently prove an actual Israeli policy to disguise genocidal intent. Destiny's observation that an actor could kill more likewise does not by itself exclude the special intent required by the Convention.

LOGIC NOTE: Distinguish a conditional counterexample to an inference from an affirmative finding about state motive. Do not record the original fabricated maximal-killing rule as a defect for Destiny or simply transfer that rule to Peterson.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-069 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Israel avoids maximum killing to maintain plausible deniability

LOCATOR: p. 14 | displayed caption clock 41:20-41:55 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"plausible deniability" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: part at le Israel's special because they're you know they have a special relationship with us and they are surrounded by hostiles um they would / conduct themselves in a way that provides for you know like a kind of plausible deniability. / Did Hamas on October 7th operate in a way that provided for plausible deniability? / No. So that's not true then, right? Has Hamas ever operated in a way that gives him plausible deniability? Hamas has nothing to lose.

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: A strategic incentive to preserve plausible deniability is a possible explanation for why an actor might not maximize killings; no demonstrated causal record here establishes it as Israel's actual objective.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Distinguish hypothetical incentives, expressed intentions, orders, operational patterns and demonstrated specific intent. Do not infer motive from an absence of maximal fatalities.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-070 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

"One bad guy" and the October 31 Jabalia strike

LOCATOR: p. 15 | displayed caption clock 42:51-43:10 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"one bad guy in there"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Yeah. I'm talking about when they engage in operations. When you choose, like specific case by case basis, when you / choose to send a 2,000lb bomb into a refugee camp because you think there's / one bad guy in there, that's what I'm talking about is why would you ever send in a 2,000lb bomb? Say that again. / Why do you send in 2,000 lb bombs? / Because well, the because you're trying to penetrate to tunnels. If they wanted to just carpet bomb the area, they could have done it / for much cheaper. You just bomb the whole place and then let everybody underneath the tunnels die.

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: The IDF identified a named Hamas commander as a principal target of the October 31, 2023 Jabalia strike and also referred to other fighters or tunnel infrastructure.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: 'One named commander' is not proof that exactly one fighter was present or that all additional harm was incidental. Verify the speaker's incident reference, target dossier and effects before resolving the one-target formulation.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: For October 31, 2023 Jabalia, the IDF publicly identified commander Ibrahim Biari as a principal target and also alleged numerous other fighters and underground infrastructure. UN investigators examined the large craters and scale of civilian damage and recorded that fuller stated objective. Source keys for this assessment: [IDFJ] [OHCHR]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The IDF account does not independently prove the number of fighters or what planners knew. Likewise, the initial focus on one commander is not evidence that he was the sole planned objective. No post-hoc list of asserted targets automatically validates the military necessity or proportionality of the operation. Source keys for this assessment: [IDFJ] [OHCHR]

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-071 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

Heavy bombs selected to reach underground tunnels

LOCATOR: p. 15 | displayed caption clock 43:10-43:44 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"because they're trying to penetrate to tunnels"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: one bad guy in there, that's what I'm talking about is why would you ever send in a 2,000lb bomb? Say that again. / Why do you send in 2,000 lb bombs? / Because well, the because you're trying to penetrate to tunnels. If they wanted to just carpet bomb the area, they could have done it / for much cheaper. You just bomb the whole place and then let everybody underneath the tunnels die. / I mean, you're treating it dichomous like the the only way to try to get anybody in Hamas is with these bombs that have these huge blast radius. / It is. It's not about huge blast radius.

ACCURATE VERSION: Penetrating or destroying underground tunnels was a rationale cited by Israeli forces for certain heavy strikes; the displayed Destiny fragment refers to reaching tunnels.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not turn the exchange into 'all heavy bombs were used solely for tunnel penetration.' The necessity of the particular weapon and availability of alternatives require strike-specific data.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: For October 31 Jabalia, Israel stated it attacked underground infrastructure; the UN Commission of Inquiry assessed crater evidence consistent with large bombs and discussed a possible delayed fuze. These records support a specific publicly stated rationale, not independent proof of every subterranean target. Source keys for this assessment: [IDFJ] [AF] [AFD] [IHL2]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A 2,000-pound Mk 84 is a general-purpose weapon; JDAM can carry general-purpose or penetrating warheads. Weight alone cannot identify the fuze, target, or requirement for a penetration effect. The exact claim that heavy bombs were the only feasible method is a different proposition. Source keys for this assessment: [IDFJ] [AF] [AFD] [IHL2]

LOGIC NOTE: A rationale explaining a weapon choice does not establish exclusivity or legal compliance. Distinguish why the IDF said it chose a weapon from whether the target existed as described and whether smaller or different alternatives were feasible.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-072 | Destiny

NOT ESTABLISHED

Leaflets and evacuation measures rule out indifference to ci

LOCATOR: p. 15 | displayed caption clock 44:08-44:22 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"why would they drop leaflets" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: It would say they're just completely indifferent to the civilian population. / Indifferent is why would they drop leaflets? Why would they make phone calls? Why would they do roof knocking? / Why would they hard people from south to north and north to south that if they were trying to kill as many civilians indifferently or as many as possible? / Only 80,000 out of 2 million.

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Warning civilians and facilitating evacuation are potentially relevant precautions, but the fact of their use cannot by itself establish that no specific attack was indifferent to civilian harm.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Assess actual warning reach, timing, feasible exit, intended objective, civilian presence and conduct of the particular attack. The disputed inference should not be reconstructed as a universal conclusion unless the speaker asserted it.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-073 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

Militant/civilian death ratio and intended military targets

LOCATOR: p. 15 | displayed caption clock 44:33-45:14 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"like 1 to four"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Like if it was 1 million Hamas militants and 1 million civilians and I bombed a 100,000 people indifferently, then I might expect to kill 50,000 militants / and 50,000 civilians all else equal. If the ratio right now is we'll say 15,000 Hamas to we'll say 60,000 civilians, um / which is like 1 to four. Do we think that there are 400,000 Hamas militants in Gaza? Probably not, right? They're / probably targeting Hamas people. Do you think that Israel targets Hamas combatants or do you think they they really just target whoever? / Well, they target people other than uh the militants. I would say it's primarily uh that they're targeting the militants. Okay. So then that's not indifferent definitionally speaking. / That's they are targeting gen like primarily they're targeting the military people, right? Mhm.

ACCURATE VERSION: Destiny's '15,000 Hamas / 60,000 civilians' and 'one to four' are illustrative assumed numbers in a conditional argument about relative targeting probabilities, not a verified casualty-status ratio.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The resulting comparison omits exposure, denominator, date, unknown-status deaths and independent target evidence. A relative association does not prove intent or lawfulness of any strike; '400,000 militants' is his counterfactual, not his actual estimate.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: A reliable exposure-adjusted excess in militants' death risk could inform an assessment of targeting patterns. The debate supplies no common period, validated militant classification, actual fighter population, comparable exposure data or verified casualty status for the quoted figures. Source keys for this assessment: [IHL] [IHL2] [G83]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: Disproportionate militant mortality could also be affected by differing locations, active fighting or other exposure. Selecting a military objective is distinct from properly minimizing reasonably foreseeable civilian harm. No overall ratio independently establishes intent or lawfulness for each attack. Source keys for this assessment: [IHL] [IHL2] [G83]

LOGIC NOTE: The possible equivocation is "indifferent to whether a target is a fighter" versus "indifferent to anticipated civilian harm." These are materially different concepts; confirm whether Peterson conceded one and disputed the other.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-074 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Human shielding does not remove the attacker's distinct leg

LOCATOR: p. 16 | displayed caption clock 45:45-46:25 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"you can't punish civilians for the crimes of their cohorts" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Sure, but they've totally abdicated that responsibility, right? Why doesn't anybody ever talk about this? / You can't punish civilians for the crimes of their cohorts. / No, but you can't prevent countries from conducting war because the other side decides to engage in maximum civilian destruction. / Have to abide by international law, including Hamas. Sk ~ +t when one party fails to act legally, that doesn't absolve another party.

ACCURATE FACT: Even if defenders use human shields, the attacker retains its own obligations of distinction, proportionality and feasible precautions.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-075 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Warning and aid facilitation are relevant precautions, not un substitutes

LOCATOR: p. 16 | displayed caption clock 46:35-46:59 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"trying to facilitate the delivery" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Have to abide by international law, including Hamas. Sk ~ +t when one party fails to act legally, that doesn't absolve another party. / For sure. Which is why you would hope that Israel would be doing things like trying to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid, trying to give ample warning to the population when it / doesn't inhibit combat operations to make sure that they're warning them before doing the strikes. And when you look at the amount of people that are still alive there despite being told / over and over again that they're all starving to death, it seems like that hasn't happened. despite being told that there's indiscriminate ...

ACCURATE FACT: Advance warnings and aid facilitation may be relevant precautions but do not replace attack-specific legal assessments.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-076 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Jordan-border surveillance recognition by sidelocks

LOCATOR: p. 17 | displayed caption clock 49:35-50:19 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"the long curly hair"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: There were people uh armed people like a I don't know like a random militia or something like that and they were coming in. I don't remember if they were / entering the West Bank or or western Israel but they were coming in from uh Jordan and they were armed and so the / Israel was observing them and they were going to launch a strike on them. Have you did you is any of this ringing? 50.03 I'm not aware of this but go ahead. It was really kind of a fascinating thing because um you know they have the drones that do the surveillance and everything. 50.10 They realized that those are actually Israelis because they could see like the long curly hair that some of the ultraorthodox Jews have. / So the reason it seems like a random thing to bring up, but we've seen like time and time again air strikes that hit / people just walking in a corridor. There was really recently um a kid got bombed and then they do they did a double

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Peterson recounts an unverified anecdote, which he says he heard recently, about surveillance personnel near the Jordan border identifying armed people by sidelocks before an alleged strike.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: No dated video, place, original report or documented targeting decision has been matched to the story. Do not report it as an authenticated instance of drone identification or export its alleged visual capability to other strikes.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The reviewed material supplies no authenticated date, location, original video, operator statement, command record or source identifying this exact chain of events. General reports of surveillance at the Jordan border and the existence of the described hairstyle do not authenticate this specific episode. Source keys for this assessment: [IHL2]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The technical possibility of recognizing hair on a suitable image depends on camera, altitude, distance, visibility and post-processing. Noticing a visual characteristic also does not alone verify nationality, armed-group status or the actual reason a planned attack was cancelled.

LOGIC NOTE: Even if true, observations made in a particular border setting would not establish the sensor information or targeting intent available in a different Gaza strike. An unverified anecdote cannot prove intentional civilian targeting elsewhere.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-077 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Recent two-strike child incident and separate bicycle video

LOCATOR: p. 17 | displayed caption clock 50:20-51:32 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions, NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"classic double tap"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: So the reason it seems like a random thing to bring up, but we've seen like time and time again air strikes that hit / people just walking in a corridor. There was really recently um a kid got bombed and then they do they did a double / attack and another at least one other young person I don't know if how many other people uh you know they go to retrieve the body or see if there's sos anything they can do and then there's this classic double tap. There's a pretty famous video fairly early on. I 5082 think it was two young men. It might have been it might have been just one, but he was, you know, walking along a a / rubbled street with a bike next to him and they got blown up and killed, And so there's this excuse of, "Oh, well, we thought they were, you know, a combatant / or something like that." When they have the resolution, reconnaissance resolution to tell by the curls of your / hair, oh, those aren't that's not Islamic jihad or those aren't that's not a militia from Jordan coming into us.

ACCURATE VERSION: Peterson appears to describe a recent two-strike attack involving a child approaching a first-strike victim and then separately recalls older bicycle footage. These should be treated as distinct examples.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Verified reporting supports a two-strike sequence in September 2026, but does not conclusively establish a plan to draw rescuers into a second strike or intentionally attack them because they assisted. The older bicycle/video match and speaker/audio boundaries remain provisional.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: Guardian reporting dated September 18, 2026 verifies footage and interviews witnesses to a September 15 Gaza City strike in which Mohammad Abdul Zinati approached wounded paramedic Sharif Shadi Labad before a second strike killed them. Israel said Labad was an alleged Hamas operative and stated that the incident was under review. Source keys for this assessment: [DT] [IHL] [REU]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The two-strike sequence is documented, but the identified public evidence does not conclusively establish that the child was selected for attack because he was assisting or that the first strike was designed to lure rescuers. The older bicycle clip remains incompletely identified in this debate fragment and should not inherit the double-tap allegation. Source keys for this assessment: [DT] [IHL] [REU]

LOGIC NOTE: A deliberate second weapons release is not logically equivalent to deliberate targeting of a rescuer as a rescuer; assess observable sequence, what operators saw, their decision and alternative explanations separately.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-078 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Recognizing ultra-Orthodox hair proves every civilian can be discriminated from fighters

LOCATOR: p. 17 | displayed caption clock 51:07-51:22 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"reconnaissance resolution to tell by the curls" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: rubbled street with a bike next to him and they got blown up and killed, And so there's this excuse of, "Oh, well, we thought they were, you know, a combatant / or something like that." When they have the resolution, reconnaissance resolution to tell by the curls of your / hair, oh, those aren't that's not Islamic jihad or those aren't that's not a militia from Jordan coming into us. / That's our people. I really just don't like all the all the accounts of, you know, the bombing of random citizens and all that.

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the universal extrapolation that recognition of sidelocks in a single alleged border incident proves that all civilians can be distinguished in every strike.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-079 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Claim of a verified Lavender AI error rate of at least 10%, as a reported anonymous-source allegation

LOCATOR: p. 18 | displayed caption clock 51:40-53:04 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"errors at least 10% of the time" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: whatever, but they have this AI program that basically looks at people and looks at a pattern of their behaviors. And then the AI has an algorithm that's s218 tuned to predict whether or not that person is affiliated with the Hamas militia. But we know that it makes / errors at least 10% of the time. Um, and is that bad? / Yes. And 10% of the time is bad. / The other thing the other thing Wait, can I ask you said 10% is bad, right? Yes. How often do humans make errors? ss sion 'Hold you humans made errors 30% of the time? sea4_ Is that the actual case here? I mean, this is 'm asking you because you told me 10% was bad. se49 But there's an issue. ...

ACCURATE VERSION: A specified Lavender error-rate figure was reported by journalists citing sources; accurately attribute the percentage and define whether it refers to selected persons, identifications or something else.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: An anonymous-source report does not independently verify a universal operational accuracy rate for every version of an algorithm or every decision made from its outputs.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-080 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Methodological need for a human baseline; surrounding alle human-error rate is separate and unverified

LOCATOR: p. 18 | displaved caption clock 52:35-53:04 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"human error rate is 5%" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Yes. And 10% of the time is bad. / The other thing the other thing Wait, can I ask you said 10% is bad, right? Yes. How often do humans make errors? ss sion 'Hold you humans made errors 30% of the time? sea4_ Is that the actual case here? I mean, this is 'm asking you because you told me 10% was bad. se49 But there's an issue. You told me 10% was bad, but if we don't know the normal fail rate of a human, we don't actually know if that 10% is bad at all. Right? 5286 It might be that 10% is an extraordinarily positive number. Maybe an ordinary human makes a mistake 15 or 20% of the time. Maybe the normal human fail rate is 5% of the time, in which / ...

ACCURATE FACT: Evaluating an algorithm's reported targeting error rate requires a defined measure and a comparable human decision baseline.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

Ledger checkpoint: 80 of 142 entries.

F-081 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

A seventeen-year-old can physically take part in fighting

LOCATOR: p. 18 | displaved caption clock 54:28-54:37 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"17-year-old can hold an AK" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: What do you mean by children? / I think everybody kind of We already went over this actually. So, no 17-year-old can hold an AK and shoot and kill seomehodvy or is that a child?

ACCURATE FACT: A seventeen-year-old is physically capable of participating in combat but remains a child under the ordinary under-18 age classification.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-082 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Under-eighteen age statistics cannot alone classify military r

LOCATOR: p. 18 | displaved caption clock 54:57-55:21 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"somebody is under" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: What do you mean by children? / I think everybody kind of We already went over this actually. So, no 17-year-old can hold an AK and shoot and kill seomehodvy or is that a child?

ACCURATE FACT: A casualty count of persons under 18 does not, by itself, identify their individual military status.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-083 | Destiny

FALSE

95% of US child firearm deaths at age 14 and above

LOCATOR: p. 19 | displayed caption clock 56:17-56:43 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"95% of those deaths are happening from 14 and up"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: 891011 1213 14 15 16 17 and then it explodes in the last 3 years. So to say that the number one cause of childhood / death are firearms when 95% of those deaths are happening from 14 and up. / That's still tragic. It's bad. I don't want people who are at any age to be dying of firearms. But you're normatively loading that word children sss_ are being killed to invoke the mind of like a swaddled toddler or a four-year-old when it could be somebody who's 15 and holding an AK. Somebody / who's 17 and is is part of military operations. Hold on. Wait just real quick. You're laughing. Hold on. Have you watched six-year-old? Have you watched a single sss I'm saying the word child? Therefore, 'm doing pmcs. / Because you are because you're saying child. Why are you saying child? Why are you saying the word child? / What's the goal when you I've explained that three times. So, I'm not going to explain it a fourth time. Okay.

CORRECTED FACT: For U.S. firearm deaths among ages 1-17 in 2023, Johns Hopkins reports 2,566 deaths, including 234 at ages 1-9. Therefore, even assigning all 530 deaths ages 10-14 to age 14, no more than 2,332/2,566 (90.9%) occurred at ages 14-17.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The actual 14-17 share is lower than 90.9%, so 95% conflicts with that defined 2023 dataset. A different denominator or year must be identified rather than silently assumed. The U.S. statistic establishes neither Gaza casualty ages nor combatant status.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: Johns Hopkins' 2023 CDC-based US ages 1-17 breakdown reports 118 deaths at ages 1-4, 116 at 5-9, 530 at 10-14 and 1,802 at 15-17 (2,566 total). Even assigning every 10-14 death to age 14 gives a maximum 2,332/2,566, or 90.9%, for ages 14-17. Source keys for this assessment: [JHU] [CRC] [ICRCD]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: Destiny does not specify a year or whether another source includes ages 18-19; this particular 2023 ages 1-17 result disproves the 95% statistic for that defined population, not for every possible differently defined dataset. The qualitative concentration among older adolescents remains supported. Source keys for this assessment: [JHU] [CRC] [ICRCD]

LOGIC NOTE: An age distribution of US gun deaths does not establish Gaza casualty ages, recruitment, membership, direct participation or the lawfulness of a strike. Calling an under-18 victim a child is compatible with the legal age definition.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the contradiction only for the expressly defined claim and data scope; preserve any independently supported qualitative point.

F-084 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Rhetorical connotation of the word "child" captions, NOT audio-certified Previously extracted claim fragment (not audio-certified): "you're trying to normatively load that word" EXTENDED DISPLAYED CAPTION CONTEXT (unlabelled conversation; transcript PDF p. 20) Searchable reading copy: people that ordinarily would never be valid military targets. That was my impression. Is that true? Yes. / Okay. That's called normatively loading the word. When you say child, the implication facts facts are normatively loaded. I mean / some can be but I'm just saying that like well then everything is normatively loaded. / True. That is very that's true. But that's a deep epistemic problem but we don't have to worry about that right now. I'm just saying that when [laughter] we say I'm just saying that when we say pedantic, / we're not being pedantic. It's not pedantic when you say they're killing children. The idea is to make them sound like demons that are murdering people indiscriminately because why else would 50.16 you ever kill an innocent child when that doesn't really describe to us whether or not the person was an enemy combat or not? We don't know that, right? Reading copy is machine-extracted and can contain OCR mistakes; the source screenshot directly below governs exact displayed wording. Adjacent lines may belong to different speakers;

neither excerpt is audio-certified.

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"you're trying to normatively load that word"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: people that ordinarily would never be valid military targets. That was my impression. Is that true? Yes. / Okay. That's called normatively loading the word. When you say child, the implication facts facts are normatively loaded. I mean / some can be but I'm just saying that like well then everything is normatively loaded. / True. That is very that's true. But that's a deep epistemic problem but we don't have to worry about that right now. I'm just saying that when [laughter] we say I'm just saying that when we say pedantic, / we're not being pedantic. It's not pedantic when you say they're killing children. The idea is to make them sound like demons that are murdering people indiscriminately because why else would 50.16 you ever kill an innocent child when that doesn't really describe to us whether or not the person was an enemy combat or not? We don't know that, right?

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the invented factual claim that Destiny asserted every child casualty was a nonparticipating toddler. He argues about the rhetorical implications of an under-18 casualty category and requests attention to ages or participation.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: An accurately defined under-18 count can call a 17-year-old a child. Age alone does not establish either civilian or combatant status, and an argument about wording is not a universal demographic claim. The principal exchange is on source PDF p.20.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The Convention on the Rights of the Child generally defines a child as someone below 18. An under-18 count may include infants, young children and older adolescents without misclassifying them. Individual military status is an additional separate issue. Source keys for this assessment: [CRC] [ICRCD]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A speaker's selection of "children" can convey vulnerability without purporting to certify the age and participation status of every person. Nor does a proposed rhetorical implication prove Peterson's private communicative intention. The disputed exchange spans transcript pp. 19-20, not only p. 19. Source keys for this assessment: [CRC] [ICRCD]

LOGIC NOTE: The defensible logical point is that age-category membership alone does not establish an individual's combat role; the converse would also be invalid. This is a semantic and pragmatic dispute, not a factual assertion by Destiny that every victim was a toddler.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-085 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Peterson's apparent real-world counterexample to Destiny's mutually agreed safe-shelter hypothetical

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"It was designated a safe place"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Do you think that it would have robbed Israel? Why are we saying this? / Because I think that it would have robbed Israel. Could you imagine if Hamas loaded a ton of civilians into a shelter and then Israel bombs them? Do / you know how untenable my position would be in this debate when you say, "Well, here was a shelter. It was designated a safe place. Hamas and Israel agreed. ss47_ Israel bombed it anyway. They have done that. / Not really though because there's not a single place in Gaza. There is not a single place in all of Gaza that Hamas has agreed is a safe zone for civilians. ses9 Not one. / There are virtually no places that Israel allows for safe zones. There are But that's not true though, right? Yeah, Destiny. There are reports in there that 10098 IDF soldiers have reported when they're watching, you know, they have a perimeter and they have the buffer zone. / When people walk into fields to try to like grab like wild either wildly growing crops or just farms that have

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: The words 'It was designated a safe place. Hamas and Israel agreed' are part of Destiny's hypothetical. Planet Peterson appears to interject 'They have done that.' The earlier ledger also added a no-Hamas-military-use premise that is not expressed in this turn. Withdraw that added proposition and keep the hypothetical speaker separate from the responding speaker.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The underlying real-world incident is unnamed in this turn. A UN shelter, an Israeli-designated humanitarian area, and a mutually negotiated military-free safe zone are not interchangeable categories. Do not attribute the hypothetical wording itself to Peterson, and do not infer categorical non-use by Hamas without incident-specific evidence.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: UNRWA documents Israel's June 6, 2024 strike on its Nuseirat school sheltering around 6,000 displaced people. Israel alleged Hamas / Islamic Jihad military use; UNRWA said it could not verify that allegation. Israel also struck al-Mawasi, which it had designated humanitarian, with military-use allegations disputed. Source keys for this assessment: [UNRWA] [UNRWA2] [IDFSCH] [ALMA] [WHO1] [IHL2]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A UN shelter designation, a unilateral Israeli humanitarian area and a mutually negotiated military-free safe zone are not equivalent. WHO separately documents temporary, geographically agreed polio vaccination pauses; no source here places the exact unnamed shelter within a comparable bilateral arrangement on the attack date.

LOGIC NOTE: A documented strike on a designated shelter is not by itself proof that a site was jointly demilitarized or unused militarily. Conversely, an IDF claim of military use is not independent proof that the claim was true or that the strike complied with IHL.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-086 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Not a single place in Gaza lacked Hamas operations

LOCATOR: p. 19 | displayed caption clock 59:50 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"not a single place in all of Gaza" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: you know how untenable my position would be in this debate when you say, "Well, here was a shelter. It was designated a safe place. Hamas and Israel agreed. ss47_ Israel bombed it anyway. They have done that. / Not really though because there's not a single place in Gaza. There is not a single place in all of Gaza that Hamas has agreed is a safe zone for civilians. ses9 Not one. / There are virtually no places that Israel allows for safe zones. There are But that's not true though, right? Yeah, Destiny. There are reports in there that 10098 IDF soldiers have reported when they're watching, you know, they have a perimeter and they have the buffer ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: An absolute claim that Hamas operated militarily at every location in Gaza requires a defined period, comprehensive evidence and the actual wording of the speaker's proposition.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A documented launch or presence in one zone does not establish a universal negative exception across all sites and dates. Temporary agreed polio pauses also differ from permanent demilitarized zones.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-087 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Observed deaths versus a maximal-killing hypothetical

LOCATOR: p. 20 | displayed caption clock 1:00:48-1:02:47 | contextual routing only | displayed automatic captions. NOT audio-certified

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"How is it that the number of civilian deaths"

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: I just don't understand how there's so much wanting and deliberate killing, so many bombs dropped, so much money on munitions, 00:6 and yet the civilian death count doesn't seem to be any. 1.009 There's no such thing as a minimum amount of death for a genocide. 1.0102 Wait, do you understand that when you say that over and over again that that's not responsive? / Many, many more points to it than just I understand, but do you understand that's nonresponsive to what I'm saying? 1.0109 I didn't even bring up genocide. I'm saying that if I told you if we were playing a video game and I'm like, "There are two million people. They're packed in this area. I've been bombing them like crazy. My soldiers kill them / when they go out to pick crops. It's freaking awesome." And I'm like, "Oh my god, 2 million. How many do you think I would imagine you've killed? 2 million, man. Have you gotten all of them?" What? / Probably over half at least, right? I'm like, you know, 74,000. You're indiscriminately killing them. 7 sion" Shooting the ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: Destiny proposes a video-game hypothetical involving roughly two million people, intensive bombing and deliberate killing, then says he would expect more than half the population killed; he does not assert that all plausible indiscriminate-attack models predict that result.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The debate supplies no reproducible model linking that scenario to over one million expected deaths. An overall reported toll and a separate civilian death count must not be conflated; a lower total does not adjudicate the legality of individual attacks. Cross-reference F-056 without double-counting its same inference.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: That prediction is not derived from modeled weapons, strikes, exposure, time, protection, evacuations and mortality completeness. The Lancet Global Health survey estimates violent deaths only through January 5, 2025; its historic confidence interval cannot be repurposed as a September 2026 census. Source keys for this assessment: [LAN] [OHCHR] [IHL]

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: A quantitative discrepancy could be probative against a precisely specified maximum-casualty model if the premises reliably imply an expected outcome. Indiscriminate attack, deliberate attacks on civilians, disproportionate attack and genocidal intent are not synonymous hypotheses and have no shared numerical minimum. Source keys for this assessment: [LAN] [OHCHR] [IHL]

LOGIC NOTE: Moving from failure to match an extreme maximal-killing scenario to rejection of every allegation of indiscriminate attack would be an unsupported inference. Destiny explicitly acknowledges that individual Israeli strikes could be war crimes; preserve that limitation.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-088 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Some attacks may warrant independent war-crime investiga

LOCATOR: p. 20 | displayed caption clock 1:01:55 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"if evaluated by the ICC or or independent parties are war crimes" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: sense here. Does that make sense? What I'm saying that it something is not is not computing here. / You're just telling me that the number could be higher. 1.0147 I'm saying that there's probably a really good reason why the number is not higher. And I understand I'm sympathetic to the idea that it might even be almost 1018s certainly is that there are IDF strikes that are rightfully if evaluated by the ICC or or independent parties are war crimes. I'm sure these things have / happened. But I'm saying that if you want to account for every single random report that we get on the IDF side, I mean, one thing I got to ask is how many reports do we ...

ACCURATE FACT: Specific attacks may warrant independent investigation for possible war crimes; an investigation is not automatically a final finding of guilt.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-089 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Observed civilian deaths fully disclose the attacker's operati process

LOCATOR: p. 20 | displayed caption clock 1:02:13-1:02:20 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"We have no insight whatsoever" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: happened. But I'm saying that if you want to account for every single random report that we get on the IDF side, I mean, one thing I got to ask is how many reports do we have on the Hamas side? / Hint is less than one. We have nothing. 1.0213 We have no insight whatsoever. We have no insight into how they operate. Well, we know because what can we observe and we observe is they try to maximize the / amount of civilian death. So when I see that there is civilian death that has occurred and I see the ratios are about in line with other wars where nobody has tried to induce as much civilian death +9228 and as compactly tight an area that has ever ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the reconstruction that aggregate death totals disclose the complete targeting decisions made by Israeli forces.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-090 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

V4 incorrectly presented the Rwanda exchange as an ICJ mer adjudication; transcript does not establish that attribution

LOCATOR: p. 21 | displayed caption clock 1:03:56-1:04:54 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"It's from an actual uh case" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Um, is that article two uh 2B or 2C of the Geneva Convention? / It's at's a so it's not it's not from any of the like legal documents. It's from an actual uh case. / It's like part of the juristp prudence of the case. / Okay. It's not um it's not the Croatia Serbian case, is it? Rwanda.

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the V4 reconstruction that Destiny cited an ICJ merits adjudication of the Rwanda genocide in this exchange. Identify the actual court, judgment and question if an audio-verified statement is later supplied.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not treat the absence of a supporting transcript claim as an empirical error by the assigned speaker. ICJ state responsibility and international criminal convictions are separate legal proceedings.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-091 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

The ICJ adjudicates state responsibility and ICC criminal liabi individuals

LOCATOR: p. 21 | displayed caption clock 1:04:54-1:05:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"the ICC is going to be the criminal court" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Technically the so the ICJ is going to be the one that is adjudicating for entire countries or for the um the prevention of genocide for that treaty. / The ICC is going to be the criminal court that's going to individually hold people responsible for committing the crime of genocide or for facilitating genocide. But but sure but go ahead. 19847 So so I bring this up because this is this is part of the jurist prudence of this case. They are telling us very plainly and this, is article 2. Ifa 110556 state actor does these things, they are committing genocidal acts. / To be clear, part of the Jewish prudence on that though is that there is no other ...

ACCURATE FACT: The ICJ assesses state responsibility in inter-state disputes, while the ICC can adjudicate individual criminal responsibility under its jurisdiction.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-092 | Planet Peterson**SUPPORTED****The prevention duty can be assessed separately from perpet convictions**

LOCATOR: p. 21 | displayed caption clock 1:05:15-1:05:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"prevention of genocide separately" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Okay. Somebody can fact check the either the president or prime minister. He He's the only person that's ever actually plead guilty. 1.0528 Sure. That's a separate thing. / Technically the so the ICJ is going to be the one that is adjudicating for entire countries or for the um the prevention of genocide for that treaty. / The ICC is going to be the criminal court that's going to individually hold people responsible for committing the crime of genocide or for facilitating genocide. But but sure but go ahead. 19847 So so I bring this up because this is this is part of the jurist prudence of this case. They are telling us very plainly and this, is ...

ACCURATE FACT: The obligation to prevent genocide is assessed under its own legal standard; it does not necessarily require a prior perpetrator's criminal conviction.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-093 | Planet Peterson**SUPPORTED****Destructive life conditions can encompass deprivation of ho hygiene and health care; judicial gloss is not Article II verbatim**

LOCATOR: p. 22 | displayed caption clock 1:03:42-1:04:00 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"lack of proper housing, clothing, hygiene, and medical care" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: For example, lack of proper housing, clothing, hygiene, and medical care. So, what would you guess that's from? / Um, is that article two uh 2B or 2C of the Geneva Convention? / It's at's a so it's not it's not from any of the like legal documents. It's from an actual uh case.

ACCURATE FACT: Destructive conditions of life can involve deprivation of food, water, shelter, sanitation or health care; the relevant act and intent must be assessed.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-094 | Destiny**SUPPORTED****The Holocaust took place during World War II but not a bilat between Jews and Germany**

LOCATOR: p. 22 | displayed caption clock 1:06:39-1:06:56 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"There was a war" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Do you think that the Jews were at war with Nazi Germany? There was a war. So you are specifically talking about the groups like the Jewish people inciting the other group.

ACCURATE FACT: The Holocaust occurred during World War II; it was not a conventional bilateral war between a Jewish nation-state and Germany.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-095 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Israel deliberately excluded infant formula and other surviva

LOCATOR: p. 22 | displayed caption clock 1:07:15-1:07:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"take out the infant formula specifically" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: the other guy, but they said like we're imposing a total siege. There will be no electricity. There will be no water. / has been allowed to come in, they do things like take out the infant formula specifically. +0747 Um they won't they won't let them bring in tent poles because they think a Hamas is going to like get on a horse and / joust a tank or something like that. I mean, just pathetic excuses for this kind of stuff. Just to be clear, I just wanted to say because I know you guys love to use these examples. You / acknowledge that basically every single building material that went into Gaza for like the past 15 years has been used to build a ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Document restrictions on infant formula and other essential supplies by naming the precise government order, the items affected and the relevant dates.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Broad reports of severe shortages do not prove that every item was deliberately prohibited throughout the period claimed. Distinguish deliberate exclusion, transport obstruction, restricted approvals and distribution failure.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-096 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

Almost every construction input supplied to Gaza over fifteen used for tunnels

LOCATOR: p. 22 | displayed caption clock 1:08:02-1:08:29 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"basically every single building material" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: joust a tank or something like that. I mean, just pathetic excuses for this kind of stuff. Just to be clear, I just wanted to say because I know you guys love to use these examples. You / acknowledge that basically every single building material that went into Gaza for like the past 15 years has been used to build a massive network of underground tunnels and none of its '0810 been really used to better the infrastructure of Gaza, right? / I don't understand percentage of Do you agree or do you disagree? Do you think that's a fantastic claim that the '10823 majority of the construction material that's gone into Gaza has been used to build a vast ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: The categorical assertion that almost every construction input entering Gaza for fifteen years went to tunnels lacks a defined evidentiary denominator.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The quantitative or categorical assertion lacks a directly matched primary evidentiary basis here. State the source, denominator, period and exact scope if that factual claim is revisited; evidence insufficiency does not establish its opposite.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-097 | Destiny

MISLEADING / OVERSTATED

Claim that hundreds of thousands of Gaza BUILDINGS were a conflated with housing-unit counts

LOCATOR: p. 22 | displayed caption clock 1:08:42-1:09:00 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"hundreds of thousands of buildings in Gaza" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: acknowledge that basically every single building material that went into Gaza for like the past 15 years has been used to build a massive network of underground tunnels and none of its '0810 been really used to better the infrastructure of Gaza, right? / I don't understand percentage of Do you agree or do you disagree? Do you think that's a fantastic claim that the '10823 majority of the construction material that's gone into Gaza has been used to build a vast network of underground tunnels that civilians are disallowed from entering? +0829 I don't I don't You don't even know about that? You have no concept of that? You have no clue of that? You're ...

CORRECTED / PRECISE FACT: Separate Gaza's count of residential units from its count of distinct buildings: one multiunit building can contain numerous housing units.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A source counting dwellings cannot support an unchanged numerical claim about buildings. State the original measurement, date, geography and whether damaged or destroyed are combined.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-098 | Destiny**UNSUPPORTED****Gaza had the most extensive underground tunnel network of worldwide**

LOCATOR: p. 22 | displayed caption clock 1:09:00-1:09:25 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"most extensive underground network" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: acknowledge that basically every single building material that went into Gaza for like the past 15 years has been used to build a massive network of underground tunnels and none of its '0810 been really used to better the infrastructure of Gaza, right? / I don't understand percentage of Do you agree or do you disagree? Do you think that's a fantastic claim that the '10823 majority of the construction material that's gone into Gaza has been used to build a vast network of underground tunnels that civilians are disallowed from entering? +0829 I don't I don't You don't even know about that? You have no concept of that? You have no clue of that? You're ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: A superlative claim that Gaza had the world's largest or most extensive tunnel network requires a defined metric and comparative evidence.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The quantitative or categorical assertion lacks a directly matched primary evidentiary basis here. State the source, denominator, period and exact scope if that factual claim is revisited; evidence insufficiency does not establish its opposite.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-099 | Planet Peterson**SUPPORTED****Claims about systematic Hamas aid diversion require indepe verifiable evidence**

LOCATOR: p. 23 | displayed caption clock 1:09:56-1:10:29 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)*"Amnesty International, the UN" [caption not audio-certified]*

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: want to read through an account of like, well, here's 10 bad things that Israel did. for most of these things. First of all, they're not usually as insanely one-sided as you're saying, like they / went in with the flower massacre with the idea of both sides of denying infant formula. There's no both sides. people racing starvation under IPCS '081 conditions in the Gaza Strip than on any than the combined entire population of the rest of the planet. I was told that and the most generous figures right now 111080 say that about 450 people have died since the start of the war from starvation. There were 60,000 children alone that died in Yemen from / ...

ACCURATE FACT: Allegations of Hamas aid diversion should be attributed and evaluated against independent distribution and inventory evidence.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-100 | Planet Peterson**UNSUPPORTED****450 people died specifically from starvation by the claimed d**

LOCATOR: p. 23 | displayed caption clock 1:10:50 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"450 people have died" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: want to read through an account of like, well, here's 10 bad things that Israel did. for most of these things. First of all, they're not usually as insanely one-sided as you're saying, like they / went in with the flower massacre with the idea of both sides of denying infant formula. There's no both sides. peupre racing starvation under IPCS '081 conditions in the Gaza Strip than on any than the combined entire population of the rest of the planet. I was told that and the most generous figures right now 111080 say that about 450 people have died since the start of the war from starvation. There were 60,000 children alone that died in Yemen from / ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: A figure of 450 starvation-attributed deaths requires a date, case definition and medical/casualty reporting source specifically classifying those deaths.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: General famine or malnutrition indicators do not substantiate an exact count of deaths certified to starvation. If citing a reported total, attribute it to the reporting body and date.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

Ledger checkpoint: 100 of 142 entries.

F-101 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Sixty thousand children alone had a specified starvation-rela

LOCATOR: p. 23 | displayed caption clock 1:10:50-1:11:06 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"60,000 children alone" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: want to read through an account of like, well, here's 10 bad things that Israel did. for most of these things. First of all, they're not usually as insanely one-sided as you're saying, like they / went in with the flower massacre with the idea of both sides of denying infant formula. There's no both sides. peupre racing starvation under IPCS '081 conditions in the Gaza Strip than on any than the combined entire population of the rest of the planet. I was told that and the most generous figures right now 111080 say that about 450 people have died since the start of the war from starvation. There were 60,000 children alone that died in Yemen from / ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the reconstructed claim that sixty thousand children had all died from a specified starvation cause; this was not a safely established utterance.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-102 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

An October 2023 offer to free all civilian hostages was ready actionable

LOCATOR: p. 24 | displayed caption clock 1:12:25-1:13:59 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"called the civilian hostages" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: went in with the flower massacre with the idea of both sides of denying infant formula. There's no both sides. peupre racing starvation under IPCS '081 conditions in the Gaza Strip than on any than the combined entire population of the rest of the planet. I was told that and the most generous figures right now 111080 say that about 450 people have died since the start of the war from starvation. There were 60,000 children alone that died in Yemen from / starvation. So like the idea that somehow there are more starving people in in Gaza than every other place on the planet combined, something is not adding up here. And when one side of the 1.1106 ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Reports that intermediaries discussed an early release of civilian hostages do not by themselves show a complete, unconditional and immediately executable offer accepted by all custodians.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Obtain the original offer, list of hostages, custody/control arrangements and reciprocal conditions. Do not conflate negotiating proposals with practical ability to release every captive.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-103 | Planet Peterson

UNSUPPORTED

Qatar's emir threatened to expel Hamas unless it released h

LOCATOR: p. 24 | displayed caption clock 1:13:59-1:14:44 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"the Amir of Qatar told them" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: No, because they still kept a large number of other hostages. / So you think that Hamas wanted to send them back for free? They were to the Amir of Qatar told them, "If you don't do this, 'm kicking you out of Doha." / And so, yes, there was an order to release civilian hostages. Netanyahu refused it. / How can Why would Hamas a bombshell report in Haram not just walk them back over then?

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: A specific claim that Qatar's emir threatened to expel Hamas requires the original statement, meeting record or reliably attributed account.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The quantitative or categorical assertion lacks a directly matched primary evidentiary basis here. State the source, denominator, period and exact scope if that factual claim is revisited; evidence insufficiency does not establish its opposite.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-104 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Netanyahu rejected an unconditional release of civilian host

LOCATOR: p. 24 | displayed caption clock 1:13:59-1:14:44 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"Netanyahu refused it" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: So you think that Hamas wanted to send them back for free? They were to the Amir of Qatar told them, "If you don't do this, 'm kicking you out of Doha." / And so, yes, there was an order to release civilian hostages. Netanyahu refused it. / How can Why would Hamas a bombshell report in Haram not just walk them back over then? / You know, all of Gaza is like fenced off and guarded with like So, why not walk them into Israeli sniper fire and let all the Israeli hostages get killed? Talk about

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Whether Netanyahu rejected an actionable unconditional offer to release all civilian hostages requires the exact proposal, his response and contemporaneous negotiation record.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A negotiator's characterization alone does not establish that a complete and deliverable deal was available at that moment. Attribute positions separately to the negotiating parties.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-105 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

The early hostage offer was impossible because Hamas coul captives across the fence

LOCATOR: p. 25 | displayed caption clock 1:15:44-1:17:00 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"sounds ridiculous" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Unlike you, I've never been there before. So, I don't I don't know what that border in that specific location looks like. This has been reported in Harets. 111832 So, Hamas could not just walk civilians. 125834 Im just asking what if you hope he does sue them cuz then itll go into discovery and we'll find out that Yeah, he is. They couldn't just walk the hostages over. Why not? 1as44_ I donit know. But you're just bother fake. Because it sounds ridiculous. 111549 Okay. Well, US intelligence corroborates this story and then sources that Harets works uh with people in Doha. The story 11888 has been corroborated. So corroborated that the Amir said this ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: Whether Hamas could have immediately delivered all captives under a proposed early offer depends on its actual custody and control at the time.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The quantitative or categorical assertion lacks a directly matched primary evidentiary basis here. State the source, denominator, period and exact scope if that factual claim is revisited; evidence insufficiency does not establish its opposite.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-106 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Israeli and Qatari intermediaries held hostage negotiations i

LOCATOR: p. 25 | displayed caption clock 1:16:02-1:17:00 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"flew to Qatar and talked to them" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: older 50 just those ones. And Netanyahu refused and I think it was Blinken. I don't remember exactly which guy. But '1639 why would Netanyahu say yes? Look at how great I am. I just got back. / know there there was a press conference on this. um he flew to he flew to Israel and still Netanyahu 11682 refused. So then he flew to Qatar and talked to them and then flew back. II do actually think a few days later maybe 111790 some of them uh did get released. I don't remember the full details. You can read it. Its a story in Harets. It was pretty big news last week cuz like I said Netanyahu's really pissed about it. / He's threatening to sue them. But ...

ACCURATE FACT: Israeli and Qatari participants and other intermediaries negotiated over captives; each attributed proposal requires its own source and date.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-107 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Some hostages were released after initial negotiations

LOCATOR: p. 25 | displayed caption clock 1:17:00 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"a few days later maybe some of them" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: older 50 just those ones. And Netanyahu refused and I think it was Blinken. I don't remember exactly which guy. But '1639 why would Netanyahu say yes? Look at how great I am. I just got back. / know there there was a press conference on this. um he flew to he flew to Israel and still Netanyahu 11682 refused. So then he flew to Qatar and talked to them and then flew back. II do actually think a few days later maybe 111790 some of them uh did get released. I don't remember the full details. You can read it. Its a story in Harets. It was pretty big news last week cuz like I said Netanyahu's really pissed about it. / He's threatening to sue them. But ...

ACCURATE FACT: Some hostages were released through negotiations; the conditions, timing and identities should be reported per release.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-108 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Article II(c) can involve deprivation of food, water or shelter

LOCATOR: p. 26 | displayed caption clock 1:18:03-1:18:24 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"starvation a total siege preventing the entry" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: getting hostages answer to that question. There's a reporting on the story, however, and you're just saying nub-uh cuz I don't know. You just Okay. 111780 Don't want to admit one thing or anything like that? I don't know. Like not trying to be personal or anything. 1.178. It's just this part just seems kind of ridiculous. Agreed. '802 So how is how is a so with the the elements of / destruction that are laid out in article 2 uh forcible transfer using starvation a total siege preventing the entry of '818 electricity fuel food water means of shelter blocking humanitarian humanitarian aid 1.1824 is it your claim that that's not even that Israel did ...

ACCURATE FACT: Article II(c) of the Genocide Convention concerns deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about a protected group's physical destruction, in whole or in part.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Deprivation of food, water, shelter or healthcare can be relevant evidence when the required conditions and special intent are established; deprivation alone does not automatically prove genocide.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-109 | Planet Peterson

FALSE

IDF never claimed Hamas diverted large portions of aid

LOCATOR: p. 26 | displayed caption clock 1:19:41-1:19:50 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"I don't think the IDF ever" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: we are for Israel but generally speaking it has to be in the absence of any military explanation you're killing a ton of people for seemingly inexplicable reasons that seems kind of genocidal / So what do you think is the military explanation for those specific things probably that they're trying to root Hamas out of the Gaza Strip and Hamas has not been rooted out of the Gaza Strip yet according to Netanyahu. sseoe thaws not that's not really an explanation of anything. You just said I literally you effectively said to defeat Hamas. 'vse reatt, But like what's the actual I guess it was a vague question. So I the feeling I mean initial claims made ...

CORRECTED FACT: Do not claim that the IDF never alleged substantial Hamas diversion of aid if there are dated official statements making that allegation.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: An IDF allegation does not establish the actual scale of diversion. Separate 'the military made the claim' from 'the claim is independently true'; cite the identified official statement.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: On 23 May 2024, IDF spokesperson Daniel Hagari publicly stated that Hamas was 'stealing aid from the people of Gaza.' That is sufficient to contradict the literal proposition that the IDF never made such an allegation. It does not establish the amount of aid actually diverted. Source: [IDF24].

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: An official military allegation proves that the allegation was made, not that the underlying theft claim or its scale is independently established.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the contradiction only for the expressly defined claim and data scope; preserve any independently supported qualitative point.

F-110 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

A single blockade-related act does not alone establish genoc

LOCATOR: p. 26 | displaved caption clock 1:20:43 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"this thing, therefore it's a genocide" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: totality of evidence. So um I kind of forgot where I was going with that, but / it's it seems like that's kind of what you're doing here. Like, oh, they did this thing, therefore it's a genocide. +2049 No, its about a pattern of conduct and it's about what actually tell me what about the pattern of conduct fits a / genocide that can't be explained with an aggressive war that you're prosecuting against an enemy that is heavily 'embedded in a civilian population that tries to induce the maximum amount of civilian casualties. / Okay, I want to ask you a few questions.

ACCURATE FACT: One blockade-related act may be relevant evidence, but it does not alone determine every element of genocide.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-111 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Attributed institutional allegations about officials' intent; no speaker-independent finding of any individual's criminal intent

LOCATOR: p. 27 | displaved caption clock 1:23:49-1:24:32 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"what the people in power say and do" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: population. He talks about how he will never leave Gaza. We will permanently occupy it. they / the you know the whole like Donald Trump Jared Kushner plan to like buy up a bunch of it and turn it into Gaza Lago or whatever that I mean I wouldn't I v2s41_ think when Netanyahu heard that he was like this [_] is even crazier than I am you know but again it really matters 1.2849 what the people in power say and do. So I think that they have a if not a genocidal mindset, a mindset of / like ethnic cleansing of this area. They act they they act like it all the time in their in their rhetoric. The things that they said right away. Netanyahu +2807 ...

ACCURATE FACT: Attribute claims about officials' intent to the exact investigating institution or quoted official; do not present a contested inference as settled fact.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-112 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Repeated conduct and orders can be considered together wh intent

LOCATOR: p. 27 | displaved caption clock 1:24:41 | contextual routiing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"pattern of military behavior" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: No. 12499 Why? Because I'm not going to take the comments of a population of people on like October 8th in response to the largest terrorist attack in the history of like any current country on the / planet and say, "These guys are all committing genocide." You have to look at the pattern of military behavior that's happened from October 7th and onwards. The reality is there's two huge things that hurt these things. / They didn't though because you can't account for the low number of deaths. 2482 You can't account for the lone and you can't account and for some reason it was turned back on a few weeks later. Even the big uh even the big event you ...

ACCURATE FACT: A legal assessment of intent may consider a course of conduct and relevant orders or statements together, with their date and context.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-113 | Destiny

QUALIFIED

The early water/aid blockade ended after only a few weeks

LOCATOR: p. 27 | displaved caption clock 1:25:01 | contextual routiing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"that was turned off in a in a few weeks" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: They didn't though because you can't account for the low number of deaths. 2482 You can't account for the lone and you can't account and for some reason it was turned back on a few weeks later. Even the big uh even the big event you were talking about in May or August of 2025 / when they did the big blockade or whatever, but sure that was turned off in a in a few weeks. Um the the idea that they're engaged in some genocidal conduct or genocidal pattern of conduct 1.2510. just isnt borne out by any of the numbers ever. And when I look at the people that are the most heav he heavily critical of

ACCURATE VERSION: Report the sequence of Gaza water, fuel and aid restrictions and partial restorations using dated measures, volumes and access conditions.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Limited resumption of some deliveries does not mean that every blockade restriction ended after a few weeks. Avoid a single end-date for distinct services or measures.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-114 | Destiny

NOT ESTABLISHED

The ICJ Gaza merits ruling will not arrive until 2029

LOCATOR: p. 28 | displaved caption clock 1:26:03 | contextual routiing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"the ICJ ruling that's not coming until 2029" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: It doesn't matter how cringe all the American leftists are. does matter though because it's exactly because of that behavior the genocide occurred depends on the / pattern of behavior in that case and the only thing that matters is the ICJ ruling that's not coming until 2029 and why are we even debating those at that point because I think 2027 is when I think the / South Africa gets to have their response and then I think Israel gets to do its rejoinder in the beginning of 2029 and then +2620. we live in the middle of history but we still have to like it's not unreasonable or irresponsible / to take a look at, you know, what is going on.

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: The ICJ's May 2026 procedural order scheduled Israel's rejoinder for May 2029; it did not schedule a final merits judgment for 2029.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: A pleading deadline is not a judgment date. Describe the pending procedural stage and avoid a categorical prediction of the court's future ruling date.

DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE: The ICJ's Order of 21 May 2026 fixed 22 November 2027 for South Africa's Reply and 22 May 2029 for Israel's Rejoinder, and expressly reserved subsequent procedure. Source: [ICJ26].

COUNTEREVIDENCE / LIMITATION: The order does not set a hearing date or judgment date. A 2029 Rejoinder deadline therefore cannot support a categorical claim that the merits ruling itself will arrive in 2029.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-115 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

A lawful military response to October 7 need not justify ever

LOCATOR: p. 28 | displayed caption clock 1:27:42-1:28:10 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"Not every single thing" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Okay. Tell me on October 8th, what was the correct response from Israel in the Gaza Strip? 12780 it. So, I don't know what the what the uh what they should have done, but the things that they did do I think are clearly wrong. All of them. / Not every single thing. / Okay. You've given me six or seven things out of 10,000 actions, a million actions, 5,000 actions.

ACCURATE FACT: A state's right to respond militarily to an attack does not establish the lawfulness of every subsequent operation.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-116 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Literal first-40-days universal destruction claim, requiring fir evidence and full audio

LOCATOR: p. 29 | displayed caption clock 1:29:29-1:30:08 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"every single" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: October 7th, all of it is bad because people have already made up their minds on it. And then a lot of the mainstream positions, right? What is what I'm going to I'm going to identify / specific things like in the first 40 days of the of the war, they bombed every single or they rendered every / single flower mill except for one. No, every single one of them inoperable. What militarily does that accomplish? / Unless your if your rationale is I'm going to bomb every flower mill, bulldoze every farm, 12982 uh we're going to completely block food, electricity, humanitarian aid, we're going to destroy the desalination plants 12989 so that Hamas will ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: A literal claim that every part of a specified area was destroyed within the first forty days requires dated, geolocated evidence and exact wording.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The present record does not identify all evidence needed to resolve this specific allegation. Obtain a dated primary source, precise location or population, and an authenticated quotation or incident record before publishing it as confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-117 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Some blockade measures may constitute collective punishm

LOCATOR: p. 29 | displayed caption clock 1:30:33-1:30:41 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"absolutely amounts to collective punishment" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Sure. I dont think collective punishment collective punishment in and of itself is defined as a war crime. So you shouldn't never do that. And I'm sure they did it. / Okay. I'm sure there are times, especially in 2025, that blockade you're talking about absolutely amounts to collective punishment, okay, which is a war crime. it's not genocide, but itis, / a war crime. But what I'm saying is that that's not a dichotomy. +048 Well, genocide is a war crime. / No, Well, not the ICC technically has different definitions of of these things. I don't think genocide and war crimes are in different categories, but vs0s5 the um what I'm saying is that no ...

ACCURATE FACT: Certain blockade measures may constitute collective punishment under applicable law; specify the measures and the basis for the assessment.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-118 | Planet Peterson

MISLEADING / OVERSTATED

Genocide and war crimes are separately codified offenses, al genocide can occur during war

LOCATOR: p. 29 | displayed caption clock 1:30:45-1:30:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"genocide is a war crime" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Sure. I dont think collective punishment collective punishment in and of itself is defined as a war crime. So you shouldn't never do that. And I'm sure they did it. / Okay. I'm sure there are times, especially in 2025, that blockade you're talking about absolutely amounts to collective punishment, okay, which is a war crime. it's not genocide, but itis, / a war crime. But what I'm saying is that that's not a dichotomy. +048 Well, genocide is a war crime. / No, Well, not the ICC technically has different definitions of of these things. I don't think genocide and war crimes are in different categories, but vs0s5 the um what I'm saying is that no ...

CORRECTED / PRECISE FACT: Genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity are different legal classifications whose elements can overlap in the same conflict.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Do not treat the categories as mutually exclusive or infer genocide from wartime destruction alone. The applicable acts and mental elements must be assessed separately.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-119 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Alleging genocide means denying any right to conduct a def

LOCATOR: p. 29 | displayed caption clock 1:31:16-1:31:28 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"no moral right to conduct that war" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: conduct is unacceptable. Um there are civilian casualties that happen. That sucks. But Hamas is operating again in +3t09 literally a way to to to enact the most amount of civilian casualties ever. That Hamas could have done things on day one that would have completely robbed Israel / of any type of even fabricated moral right to conduct that war. that to claim that one side is being genocided while they're Seetifiems fenctstoeenenen Ail @iuee atten

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the reconstructed inference that alleging genocide logically means denying any right of military defense.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-120 | Destiny

NOT ESTABLISHED

Israeli transparency makes all alleged violations knowable w Hamas acts are opaque

LOCATOR: p. 30 | displayed caption clock 1:31:47-1:32:26 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"unlimited transparency on the Israeli side" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: These are unworkable standards. And what it's done is it's removed us from a world where we can even criticize Israel 'And it just put us in a world where everybody just scream over and over again, genocide, genocide, / genocide, genocide, without having any actual solution for any part of the conflict. And and that's why right now, today on on Friday the 18th of 2020, 13187 whatever [] year we're in 26, we are no closer right now to having any kind of idea of what a solution looks like for this conflict. And I would / argue the vast majority of the people that talk about it don't even know what a solution would look like to the conflict. Do you ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Transparency about some military actions cannot show that all possible violations are knowable while those of an adversary are categorically unknowable.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Identify which evidence is public for each alleged incident and the limitations on access, verification and accountability for both parties rather than making a universal information claim.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

Ledger checkpoint: 120 of 142 entries.

F-121 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Large-scale civilian displacement and destruction affect hun thousands

LOCATOR: p. 31 | displayed caption clock 1:34:59 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"hundreds of thousands if not over a million" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: This goes to the destruction part. So like this is um this is by Rafa, right? / So like in the southern part of Gaza, uh around 600,000 people lived in the southern part. So this was it in it's asa either 2021 or 2022 and 600,000 people live there. seae ene atin this specific one, but hundreds of thousands of people lve there. Yes. / And it was completely It looks like it was completely destroyed. Yes. / Why aren't hundreds of thousands of people dead? 13882 I'm not talking about uh they were evacuated from Rafa. What? 19557 How many? Okay. Il really don't I haven't done much research. Okay. But like for the Rwanda genocide, the people that they ...

ACCURATE FACT: Large-scale displacement and destruction affected many Gaza residents; use a dated geography and a source for any exact number.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This statement is supported only in its described scope, not as an unqualified explanation of conduct or outcomes in other incidents.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-122 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Around 600,000 people lived in the exact southern area sho

LOCATOR: p. 31 | displayed caption clock 1:35:27 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"around 600,000 people lived in the southern part" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: This goes to the destruction part. So like this is um this is by Rafa, right? / So like in the southern part of Gaza, uh around 600,000 people lived in the southern part. So this was it in it's asa either 2021 or 2022 and 600,000 people live there. seae ene atin this specific one, but hundreds of thousands of people lve there. Yes. / And it was completely It looks like it was completely destroyed. Yes. / Why aren't hundreds of thousands of people dead? 13882 I'm not talking about uh they were evacuated from Rafa. What? 19557 How many? Okay. Il really don't I haven't done much research. Okay. But like for the Rwanda genocide, the people that they ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: An alleged population of approximately 600,000 within the precise southern area requires the area's mapped boundaries and the date of the estimate.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The present record does not identify all evidence needed to resolve this specific allegation. Obtain a dated primary source, precise location or population, and an authenticated quotation or incident record before publishing it as confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-123 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Question about a death threshold, not an affirmative legal ru a fact

LOCATOR: p. 31 | displayed caption clock 1:35:50 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"Why aren't hundreds of thousands of people dead?" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: This goes to the destruction part. So like this is um this is by Rafa, right? / So like in the southern part of Gaza, uh around 600,000 people lived in the southern part. So this was it in it's asa either 2021 or 2022 and 600,000 people live there. seae ene atin this specific one, but hundreds of thousands of people lve there. Yes. / And it was completely It looks like it was completely destroyed. Yes. / Why aren't hundreds of thousands of people dead? 13882 I'm not talking about uh they were evacuated from Rafa. What? 19557 How many? Okay. Il really don't I haven't done much research. Okay. But like for the Rwanda genocide, the people that they ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the alleged legal death-threshold rule; the cited turn appears to pose a question rather than assert a minimum genocide death toll.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-124 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Homes being destroyed is wholly irrelevant to genocide

LOCATOR: p. 31 | displayed caption clock 1:36:24-1:36:38 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"all their homes were genocided" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: it's not like genocides can't happen in two different ways, but like all their homes were genocided. Okay. / With all these buildings, I have a landlord friend. He would say it's like property genocide. There's nothing left of any of these. Okay. / Um and it's just I mean it goes on and on and on and on like this. They did this with bulldozers. Um they did this 1.3048. like in slow motion. And then cuz right away the bombing and everything like in the north the buildings that are destroyed you can still see them but 13083 they're just it looks like a call of duty map right? They're just completely wiped out. But in the south in the south its it's ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the claim that Destiny said property destruction is entirely irrelevant to genocide; the passage does not establish that absolute proposition.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-125 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Bulldozer tracks and razed housing are visible in some Gaza

LOCATOR: p. 31 | displayed caption clock 1:36:38-1:37:47 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"They did this with bulldozers" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: With all these buildings, I have a landlord friend. He would say it's like property genocide. There's nothing left of any of these. Okay. / Um and it's just I mean it goes on and on and on and on like this. They did this with bulldozers. Um they did this 1.3048. like in slow motion. And then cuz right away the bombing and everything like in the north the buildings that are destroyed you can still see them but 13083 they're just it looks like a call of duty map right? They're just completely wiped out. But in the south in the south its it's really extremely disturbing because this isrit from air strikes. / They evacuated everybody to the south in ...

ACCURATE FACT: Satellite and ground imagery show demolition or razed housing in identified parts of Gaza; identify dates, location and method before generalizing.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-126 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Housing destruction may be relevant to life-conditions evide did not say buildings alone establish genocide

LOCATOR: p. 32 | displayed caption clock 1:38:01-1:39:51 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"destruction of a people isn't killing" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: wanting destruction of a people cuz destruction of a people isnt killing. / Destruction of a people includes also destroying their way of life going at and this also goes into the harm thing cuz going after like religious sites. / I'm just curious what do you think it's going to look like in 15 years? Do you think it's going to look the same or do you think it's going to be majority rebuilt? / There's an estimate in the report actually that if you had 105 trucks every single day, it would take 21 years just to get rid of the rubble.

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the assertion that Peterson treated demolished buildings, standing alone, as legally sufficient proof of genocide.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-127 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

Israel deliberately destroyed every crop and all farmland in t area

LOCATOR: p. 32 | displayed caption clock 1:38:47-1:39:14 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"all the fields" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: I mean, welll we'll meet back up in 15 [laughter] years. I guess we can discuss that. But this this is the part of it +3847 that was the most disturbing to me. And then like they deliberately destroyed all the crops too, lke all the fields. skipnavignion 'UStWent in there and they're either just not being maintained and so some of them look some of them look green Sepneneeh' "rest mean like 19902 you can zoom in and there's just like bulldozer tracks everywhere. They just deliberately destroyed the farmland and all of the residents for 600,000 people. / Now, if their goal I mean I could see that being like ethnic cleansing or genocide because it's ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: Document the specific area, assessed date and mapped agricultural losses before attributing deliberate destruction of all crops and every field to Israeli forces.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Damage maps do not on their own establish agency, intention or 100% loss, and another date's map cannot replace the claimed period.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established.

F-128 | Planet Peterson

QUALIFIED

Literal every-residence/site destruction claim; scope and obs date are material

LOCATOR: p. 32 | displayed caption clock 1:39:42 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"every single residence" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: That was never the original plan but okay there's there's a report on that from Egypt is accepting 2 million refugees is never the plan. / I mean I said it I mean who am I to judge though? I mean maybe who knows but okay go ahead. the report says so you're saying sounds unrealistic so I don't '3942 believe it but whatever let's not bicker about that um but yeah the complete demolition of every single residence and 13981 every culturally significant area uh throughout there that is just that is the destruction of a group of people !! '4001 mean I don't know if you disagree but I don't think I would say that's a destruction of a group of people but ...

ACCURATE VERSION: State the assessed date, geographic unit and numerator/denominator for reports that all or nearly all residential structures in an area were damaged or destroyed.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: 'Every residence' should not be used if the study reports a percentage, samples limited imagery or combines damage levels. Do not silently move between neighbourhood, city and the whole Gaza Strip.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the qualified claim and state the specific limitation beside it; do not present the qualified result as unconditional.

F-129 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Property destruction without protected-group destruction in itself prove genocide

LOCATOR: p. 33 | displayed caption clock 1:41:16 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"I don't think it's genocide" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: I don't know why. 'm not sure why that is the case, but I don't I don't know what that was all about. But so when you're trying to argue that like they've destroyed all the homes, how is 'nas this anything but the destruction of a people, which is genocide? It sounds like a lot of destruction and destruction of homes. None of that is genocidal. That's not genocide. None of that is genocide. It can all be bad. 14187, Itwas systematic and deliberate. I mean, it it happened in slow motion. It took it can happen in ultra slow motion. It's still not genocide. swe Ole So, earlier when you were telling me um you know the 72,000 people or whatever itis, uh if ...

ACCURATE FACT: Property destruction by itself does not prove the distinct legally required destruction of a protected group and special intent.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-130 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

No historical genocide ever involved a comparable displacement/demolition sequence

LOCATOR: p. 33 | displayed caption clock 1:42:36 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"we've never heard of a genocide in all history" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Im saying that if Israel was legitim Hold on. I'm saying that if by your reporting they're indiscriminately shooting and killing and murdering every random person, there's no bloodthirsty sometimes. I just think the number would 'v4z23_be higher. That's what it sounds like to me. But you're saying that they're not doing that all the time, just sometimes. / And but they are doing it, but not but it's a genocide. Even though the ratios aren't completely off, but like they're not doing it so much that other people 114236. will notice even though we've never heard of a genocide in all history that's done like this. But that's that was your argument, but ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the historical universal that no genocide ever involved a comparable displacement and demolition pattern.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-131 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

Miami hypothetical is a conditional analogy, not a declaratio expulsion alone legally equals genocide

LOCATOR: p. 33 | displayed caption clock 1:43:57-1:44:19 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"that's a genocide" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: They could in this case like what you were talking about with the killings. '4844 Oh, it could have been higher. They couldn't have done more in the south. vus47_ They they basically couldnt. Every single thing is just gone down there. They couldnt have done more. 1.4387 So, if I pushed all the people out of Miami and I blew up all of their homes, that's a genocide. If I blew all the homes out, it could be an ethnic cleansing. 'vatos I didn't ask if it was ethnic cleansing. / I said, "Could that be a genocide? If I blew all the homes out, like millions of people in the Miami metropolitan area, that's

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: The Miami discussion is a conditional analogy about hypothetical mass expulsion, not a standalone claim that expulsion necessarily equals genocide.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-132 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Genocide assessment of a destroyed city depends on intent acts

LOCATOR: p. 34 | displayed caption clock 1:44:19 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"It would depend on what the intent" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: depend like with uh Hiroshima and Nagasaki, people don't consider that um a genocide. Why? because the United 'ts States occupied Japan after that and did nation building with them. So the purpose the purpose of dropping the 'vaess_ bombs was yes to create as much death as they could to get the United States surrender to surrender but it was about 'sz way more than that. Again we occupied Japan and we we it to make it simple cuz we're running out of time. We broke it and we fixed sor it. There's none of that go there's absolutely no whiff of that kind of intention going on with this aspect. 'v4s10 So if Trump moves in with the Gaza Beach plan then ...

ACCURATE FACT: Whether destruction of a city constitutes genocide depends on prohibited acts and intent, not the physical damage alone.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-133 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

Japan was later rebuilt after the US wartime nuclear attacks

LOCATOR: p. 34 | displayed caption clock 1:44:43-1:46:04 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"we went in there and rehabilitated the country" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: depend like with uh Hiroshima and Nagasaki, people don't consider that um a genocide. Why? because the United 'ts States occupied Japan after that and did nation building with them. So the purpose the purpose of dropping the 'vaess_ bombs was yes to create as much death as they could to get the United States surrender to surrender but it was about 'sz way more than that. Again we occupied Japan and we we it to make it simple cuz we're running out of time. We broke it and we fixed sor it. There's none of that go there's absolutely no whiff of that kind of intention going on with this aspect. 'v4s10 So if Trump moves in with the Gaza Beach plan then ...

ACCURATE FACT: Japanese cities destroyed by U.S. wartime nuclear attacks were subsequently rebuilt; rebuilding does not answer the legality of the prior conduct.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This historical or dated description does not independently establish facts or tactical alternatives for a different incident; keep the original event, location and cutoff explicit.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-134 | Planet Peterson

SUPPORTED

Post-conflict rebuilding does not logically negate a prior atro

LOCATOR: p. 34 | displayed caption clock 1:45:01-1:46:25 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"That doesn't determine whether it is" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: depend like with uh Hiroshima and Nagasaki, people don't consider that um a genocide. Why? because the United 'ts States occupied Japan after that and did nation building with them. So the purpose the purpose of dropping the 'vaess_ bombs was yes to create as much death as they could to get the United States surrender to surrender but it was about 'sz way more than that. Again we occupied Japan and we we it to make it simple cuz we're running out of time. We broke it and we fixed sor it. There's none of that go there's absolutely no whiff of that kind of intention going on with this aspect. 'v4s10 So if Trump moves in with the Gaza Beach plan then ...

ACCURATE FACT: Later reconstruction does not logically negate whether an earlier atrocity occurred.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-135 | Destiny

SUPPORTED

The Nazi genocide was not a conventional war against a Jewi nation-state

LOCATOR: p. 34 | displayed caption clock 1:46:53-1:47:13 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)

"I don't think Germany was at war with the Jews" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: intent behind it was. Yes. We intended to kill all those civilians for a specific military strategy and then we '4621 went in there and rehabilitated the country. We're currently an ally with them. / We didn't have to go in and rehabilitate it for it to not be a genocide though. '431 It sounded to me like a little bit ago you were arguing that there's a really compelling case that it was a genocide for for what? For Nagasaki 'v4es1 No, I'm saying no, it wasn't a genocide because we're at war with them. But you're saying, "Well, because we helped them afterwards, it didrit count as a genocide" 'v4e49 A war and a genocide can coexist. In fact, in ...

ACCURATE FACT: The Nazi genocide of European Jews was not a conventional war fought against a separate Jewish state.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: This legal or conceptual statement does not resolve the facts, target status, intent or legality of any particular strike or person's conduct.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain only the narrow supported proposition. This status does not extend to adjacent unanswered empirical or legal questions.

F-136 | Planet Peterson

WITHDRAWN

A demolition site had no Hamas tunnel beneath it

LOCATOR: p. 35 | displayed caption clock 1:47:59-1:48:44 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"a concrete tunnel underneath" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: that would be basically inexplicable when it comes to, you know, military behavior. But the fact that Hamas is still Do you have a separate explanation other 7s2_ than deliberate destruction for rendering the south of Gaza just flat? / Let's say that we had a magical gun right here that would kill one of us if we were wrong, And if somebody were to ask you, do you think you could point to a building at random there that there 14e07_ was not a concrete tunnel underneath that Hamas was operating out of? Do you think that you would be more or less than 50% likely to pick a building that didn't have a tunnel underneath it? / You're asking me if it's ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the assertion that Peterson established the absence of a Hamas tunnel under a particular demolished site.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-137 | Destiny

UNSUPPORTED

The chance that a particular razed block contained no tunnel chance

LOCATOR: p. 35 | displayed caption clock 1:48:26-1:48:44 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"less than chance" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: Let's say that we had a magical gun right here that would kill one of us if we were wrong, And if somebody were to ask you, do you think you could point to a building at random there that there 14e07_ was not a concrete tunnel underneath that Hamas was operating out of? Do you think that you would be more or less than 50% likely to pick a building that didn't have a tunnel underneath it? / You're asking me if it's above chance that a randomly selected building in the south of Gaza has a tunnel under it? Yes. 114826 No, I don't think it's I think it's less than chance. just gure won't know how / else to like an area with 600,000 people in it is going ...

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: Without a comprehensive geolocated tunnel map and records for the specific razed block, the chance that there was no tunnel under it cannot be assigned a near-zero numerical or categorical probability.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: General tunnel density is not a substitute for an observation of the precise site. Distinguish possible presence from evidence of necessity to destroy each structure.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

F-138 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

There are 60,000 tunnels or structures over 140 km of netwo

LOCATOR: p. 35 | displayed caption clock 1:48:44 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"60,000 structures a network of tunnels" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: else to like an area with 600,000 people in it is going is going to have if we assume there's 10 crazy right building / 60,000 structures a network of tunnels under 60,000 isn't it like 140 km reasonable it's not reasonable. I agree with you there 100%. 11485 But every single thing Hamas does when they're operating out of here, no civilian shelters. All the concrete and extra labor was going into building all of these different underground tunnels. / They use these tunnels to attack Israel in the past. Like bulldozing the buildings doesn't get rid of the tunnels. That's the whole point of why they demolish and destroy 'ez everything. Yes. Cuz you ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the reconstruction that Destiny gave a verified figure of 60,000 distinct tunnels across a 140-km network; the quoted numerical units are not established.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-139 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Case-specific feasibility discussion, not a claim that EVERY s building MUST be destroyed to remove tunnels

LOCATOR: p. 35 | displayed caption clock 1:49:04-1:49:21 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"you can't get rid of the stuff underneath" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: 60,000 structures a network of tunnels under 60,000 isn't it like 140 km reasonable it's not reasonable. I agree with you there 100%. 11485 But every single thing Hamas does when they're operating out of here, no civilian shelters. All the concrete and extra labor was going into building all of these different underground tunnels. / They use these tunnels to attack Israel in the past. Like bulldozing the buildings doesn't get rid of the tunnels. That's the whole point of why they demolish and destroy 'ez everything. Yes. Cuz you can't get rid of the stuff underneath without just like taking out everything on top before the before the military ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the universal that Destiny said every surface building must be destroyed to eliminate tunnels; the turn is a case-specific feasibility discussion.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-140 | Planet Peterson

UNSUPPORTED

Israeli negotiators always get a peace proposal last and add

LOCATOR: p. 36 | displayed caption clock 1:50:42-1:51:03 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"they always would add conditions" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: These are like weeks. Israel gets to look at it last and then they always would add conditions like the complete disarmament of Hamas.

WHAT THE EVIDENCE ACTUALLY ESTABLISHES: A universal account that one negotiating side always receives the last proposal and invariably inserts new demands is not established by the identified exchange.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: Specify which round of talks, mediator proposal, participants and revision record are meant. Isolated reported changes do not establish 'always' across negotiations.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Retain the evidence-insufficiency finding for the stated numerical or categorical claim; do not infer its logical negation.

Ledger checkpoint: 140 of 142 entries.

F-141 | Destiny

WITHDRAWN

Overbroad universal peace-negotiations formulation; duplica audio scope not resolved

LOCATOR: p. 37 | displayed caption clock 1:50:31 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"every single peace agreement" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: What do you mean? Hamas and the Arabs have sabotaged every single peace agreement. / What I mean is that through mediators, the US and Qatar ...

ATTRIBUTION / CLAIM CORRECTION: Withdraw the attributed universal claim about all peace negotiations; duplicate speaker routing and the exact scope remain unverified.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: The earlier categorical factual proposition was not safely established as the assigned speaker's utterance. Do not count it as an error or replace it with a new proposition until the full turn and speaker boundary are confirmed.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Do not count this reconstructed proposition as an error by the assigned speaker. Preserve an audio-checked rhetorical or conceptual observation separately if relevant.

F-142 | Planet Peterson

NOT ESTABLISHED

An internationally recognized right of armed resistance exist

LOCATOR: p. 37 | displayed caption clock 1:51:11-1:51:20 | contextual routing only

DISPLAYED CAPTION FRAGMENT (NOT AUDIO-CERTIFIED)
"internationally recognized right to uh armed resistance" [caption not audio-certified]

ADJACENT CAPTION CONTEXT: It is also a human right to ... I am not excusing October 7th but I am just explaining it is also an internationally recognized right to armed resistance to ...

WHAT CAN BE SAID SAFELY: International-law discussions of self-determination and resistance must specify the governing instrument, party status and the permitted means of conduct.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY: No asserted right of resistance supplies a blanket license to target civilians or a general exemption from the laws of war. Do not treat an attributed UN resolution as authorizing any tactic.

FINAL EDITORIAL TREATMENT: Maintain the completed finding of insufficient evidence; do not relabel it FALSE or treat a specific operational claim as established. PANGBURN ANALYSIS | V13 | FINAL EVIDENCE DISPOSITION REGISTER 23 SEP 2026 | AUDIO BOUNDARIES NOT CERTIFIED 1 Complete

7. Final disposition index

This index is a navigation aid. WITHDRAWN entries remain visible for traceability and are not counted as factual defects.

SUPPORTED (51)

F-003, F-006, F-007, F-009, F-010, F-012, F-013, F-020, F-024, F-028, F-031, F-032, F-036, F-039, F-040, F-041, F-042, F-046, F-052, F-054, F-059, F-062, F-064, F-066, F-067, F-074, F-075, F-080, F-081, F-082, F-088, F-091, F-092, F-093, F-094, F-099, F-106, F-107, F-108, F-110, F-111, F-112, F-115, F-117, F-121, F-125, F-129, F-132, F-133, F-134, F-135

QUALIFIED (28)

F-001, F-002, F-005, F-011, F-015, F-016, F-019, F-021, F-022, F-023, F-026, F-027, F-029, F-033, F-034, F-037, F-047, F-048, F-049, F-055, F-060, F-063, F-071, F-073, F-077, F-079, F-113, F-128

NOT ESTABLISHED (21)

F-017, F-018, F-038, F-050, F-051, F-053, F-058, F-061, F-069, F-070, F-072, F-076, F-095, F-102, F-104, F-114, F-116, F-120, F-122, F-127, F-142

UNSUPPORTED (13)

F-014, F-056, F-057, F-065, F-086, F-087, F-096, F-098, F-100, F-103, F-105, F-137, F-140

MISLEADING / OVERSTATED (2)

F-097, F-118

FALSE (3)

F-044, F-083, F-109

WITHDRAWN (24)

F-004, F-008, F-025, F-030, F-035, F-043, F-045, F-068, F-078, F-084, F-085, F-089, F-090, F-101, F-119, F-123, F-124, F-126, F-130, F-131, F-136, F-138, F-139, F-141

8. Case-specific logic and inference analysis

This section identifies inference risks in selected arguments. A fallacy label is conditional unless the stronger inference is actually asserted. Questions, analogies and hypotheses are not treated as categorical factual claims merely because they are rhetorically forceful.

Destiny - F-047 / F-049

Specific incidents vs. universal safe-zone claims

Logical category: Potential overgeneralization / scope shift

Evidence of military activity at one location does not establish use of every protected route or site; conversely, temporary localized pauses do not by themselves prove a durable bilateral demilitarized sanctuary.

Destiny - F-051 / F-053

Operational impossibility from a historical analogy

Logical category: Potential weak analogy / unsupported necessity

A raid in another theater does not prove feasibility in Gaza, while a more difficult threat environment does not prove that no lower-harm alternative was possible. Mission-specific facts are required.

Destiny - F-056 / F-087

Observed deaths vs. hypothetical maximal toll

Logical category: Unspecified counterfactual baseline / possible equivocation

A lower observed toll can challenge a maximal-killing hypothesis only if the expected counterfactual toll is defensible. It does not independently resolve whether particular attacks were unlawful or whether genocidal intent existed.

Destiny - F-061

Journalist status and alleged military role

Logical category: Category leap / source-to-fact conversion

A military allegation or a person's presence as a journalist does not independently establish tactical reconnaissance or direct participation in hostilities.

Destiny - F-071

Tunnel rationale vs. exclusive weapon necessity

Logical category: Possible necessity fallacy only if a sole-option claim is asserted

A tunnel objective can explain a weapon choice without proving that the particular weapon was the only feasible means or that anticipated civilian harm satisfied IHL requirements.

Destiny - F-073

Age distributions and combatant inference

Logical category: Base-rate / exposure confounding; possible equivocation

An age distribution can be relevant context but does not classify individual casualties as combatants or establish direct participation in hostilities.

Destiny - F-083

U.S. child firearm statistics used in Gaza discussion

Logical category: Weak cross-population analogy / demographic-status substitution

A U.S. age distribution does not establish Gaza casualty ages, armed-group membership, direct participation or strike lawfulness.

Destiny - F-084

Withdrawn attribution

Logical category: No fallacy finding

The factual card was withdrawn; it is not reinstated through the logic appendix.

Planet Peterson - F-055

Reported casualty-ratio precision

Logical category: Possible false precision / parameter omission

A ratio is only meaningful with a defined time window, denominator, combatant classification method and source.

Planet Peterson - F-060

One strike method as proof another method was feasible

Logical category: Potential weak analogy / feasibility extrapolation

A lower-harm method used in one operation does not establish that the same method was feasible for a different target under different constraints.

Planet Peterson - F-068 / F-069

Plausible deniability

Logical category: Correct counterexample; motive inference remains unproved

Showing that a hypothetical genocidal actor might conceal or limit violence rebuts a maximal-killing premise, but the possibility of concealment does not prove an actual concealment policy.

Planet Peterson - F-070

One named commander vs. one-and-only-one target

Logical category: Possible exclusive-target inference

A singular reference to a principal commander does not establish that no additional militants or military objectives were present; additional asserted targets do not automatically justify civilian harm.

Planet Peterson - F-076

Border-recognition anecdote vs. Gaza surveillance

Logical category: Weak analogy / unverified premise

Even an authenticated sensor-identification incident at one border would not establish what was visible to operators during a different Gaza strike.

Planet Peterson - F-077

Two weapons releases vs. intent to target rescuers

Logical category: Possible affirming the consequent / motive leap

A second strike after people approach a first victim warrants investigation but the sequence alone does not prove rescuers were intentionally targeted because they were rescuers.

Planet Peterson - F-079

AI target-system error rate

Logical category: Denominator ambiguity / ecological inference

A reported system-level error percentage is uninterpretable without the sampled population and definition of error and does not prove a particular strike was mistaken or unlawful.

Planet Peterson - F-085

Shelter designation vs. mutually protected site

Logical category: Possible equivocation / unverified counterexample

A UN shelter or unilaterally designated humanitarian area is not necessarily equivalent to a bilaterally agreed military-free safe zone.

Planet Peterson - F-102 / F-103

Hostage-negotiation narratives

Logical category: Possible false dichotomy / compression of conditional offers

Evidence that mediation or an offer existed does not establish that an unconditional release was available and rejected on the terms implied. Offer, conditions, acceptance and implementation must remain distinct.

Cross-speaker control

Several exchanges involve different questions that should not be collapsed: death count vs. genocidal intent; military-objective status vs. precautions/proportionality; demographic ratios vs. individual civilian/combatant status; humanitarian designations vs. negotiated safe-zone terms; and video sequence vs. proof of operator intent.

9. Evidence register

Sources support only the specific propositions for which they are cited. A source that records a military, governmental, NGO or political allegation is evidence that the allegation was made unless the report separately identifies corroboration.

[IHL]	ICRC, Customary IHL, rules 11-21	https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/customary-ihl/v2
[IHL2]	ICRC, customary IHL precautions and target verification	https://casebook.icrc.org/case-study/icrc-customary-international-humanitarian-law
[GEN]	United Nations, Genocide Convention, Article II	https://www.un.org/en/genocide-prevention/1948-convention
[ICC]	ICC, Palestine territorial-jurisdiction ruling, 5 February 2021	https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/icc-pre-trial-chamber-i-issues-its-decision-prosecutors-request-related-territorial
[ROME]	International Criminal Court, Rome Statute, Article 12	https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/Publications/Rome-Statute.pdf
[WHO1]	WHO, first polio-campaign phase, 4 September 2024	https://www.who.int/news/item/04-09-2024-first-phase-of-polio-campaign-concludes-successfully-in-gaza
[WHO2]	WHO, Gaza first-round polio-campaign results, 13 September 2024	https://www.who.int/news/item/13-09-2024-around-560-000-children-vaccinated-in-first-round-of-polio-campaign-in-gaza
[QAT]	Qatar MFA, extension of Gaza humanitarian pause, 27 November 2023	https://mofa.gov.qa/en/qatar/latest-articles/latest-news/details/1445/05/13/qatar-announces-agreement-between-palestinian-israeli-sides-to-extend-humanitarian-pause-for-two-additional-days
[QAT25]	Qatar MFA, Israel-Hamas January 2025 ceasefire agreement	https://mofa.gov.qa/en/qatar/latest-articles/latest-news/details/2025/01/15/prime-minister-and-minister-of-foreign-affairs-announces-gaza-ceasefire-deal
[AM]	Amnesty International, Gaza conflict Q&A, July 2014	https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2014/07/israelgaza-conflict-questions-and-answers/
[AM09]	Amnesty International, Gaza military tactics, 7 January 2009	https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2009/01/gaza-military-tactics-both-sides-endangering-civilians-says-amnesty-intel/
[G83]	Guardian / +972 / Local Call, analysis of purported IDF casualty database, 21 August 2025	https://www.theguardian.com/world/ng-interactive/2025/aug/21/revealed-israeli-militarys-own-data-indicates-civilian-death-rate-of-83-ingaza-war
[UN75]	UN Commission of Inquiry, report A/80/337, August 2025, paragraph 15	https://www.un.org/unispal/document/report-of-coi-14aug25/
[MSF]	MSF, Gaza aid-distribution gunshot injury patterns, August 2025	https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/latest/us-backed-aid-distribution-points-gaza-are-sites-orchestrated-killing
[HRW]	Human Rights Watch, Gaza aid-site incident investigation, 1 August 2025	https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/08/01/gaza-israeli-killings-of-palestinians-seeking-food-are-war-crimes
[IDFCOR]	IDF, report of alleged rocket fire from humanitarian route, 13 August 2024	https://www.idf.il/en/mini-sites/idf-press-releases-israel-at-war/august-24-pr/hamas-launches-rockets-from-humanitarian-area-in-khan-yunis/
[IDFJ]	UN Commission of Inquiry, detailed Jabalia reconstruction, A/HRC/56/CRP.4, paras 192-195	https://www.un.org/sexualviolenceinconflict/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Detailed-findings-on-the-military-operations-and-attacks-carried-out-in-the-Occupied-Palestinian-Territory-from-7-October-to-31-December-2023-1.pdf
[PLOS]	PLOS Global Public Health, proximity of Mk 84 detonations to hospitals, 2024	https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11466298/
[AF]	US Air Force, Joint Direct Attack Munition GBU-31/32/38 fact sheet	https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Fact-Sheets/Display/Article/104572/joint-direct-attack-munition-gbu-313238/
[AFD]	US Department of Defense, weapon procurement and JDAM warhead options, FY2026	https://comptroller.war.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/FY2026/FY2026_Weapons.pdf
[CIA]	CIA, The Final Chapter in the Hunt for Bin Ladin	https://www.cia.gov/legacy/museum/exhibit/the-final-chapter-in-the-hunt-for-bin-ladin/
[EURO]	Euro-Med Monitor, Refaat Alareer apartment investigation, 8 December 2023	https://euromedmonitor.org/en/article/6014/Israeli-Strike-on-Refaat-al-Areer-Apparently-Deliberate
[ICRCJ]	ICRC, protection of journalists under IHL, 2026	https://www.icrc.org/en/article/international-humanitarian-law-protect-journalists-armed-conflict
[ICRCD]	ICRC, direct participation in hostilities, questions and answers	https://www.icrc.org/en/article/direct-participation-hostilities-questions-answers
[UNRWA]	UNRWA, Nuseirat school shelter strike, 6-7 June 2024	https://www.unrwa.org/newsroom/features/no-shelter-war-bombing-block-2-unrwa-nuseirat-school
[UNRWA2]	UNRWA, statement on military-use allegation, 6 June 2024	https://www.unrwa.org/newsroom/official-statements/another-horrific-day-gaza
[IDFSCH]	IDF, stated rationale for Nuseirat school strike, 6 June 2024	https://www.idf.il/en/mini-sites/unrwa-hamas-connection/exploitation-of-unrwa-schools/did-the-idf-strike-an-unrwa-school-in-nuseirat/
[ALMA]	Reuters, Israeli strike in al-Mawasi designated humanitarian area, September 2024	https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/several-palestinians-killed-wounded-israeli-strike-tent-encampment-gaza-medics-2024-09-09/
[OHCHR]	UN Human Rights Office, six Gaza airstrike assessments, 19 June 2024	https://www.un.org/unispal/document/ohchr-thematic-report-indiscriminate-attacks-in-gaza-19jun24/

[JHU]	Johns Hopkins, annual US firearm mortality data for ages 1-17 in 2023	https://publichealth.jhu.edu/center-for-gun-violence-solutions/data/annual-gun-violence-data-2023
[CRC]	OHCHR, Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 1	https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child
[LAN]	Lancet Global Health, Gaza Mortality Survey, violent deaths through 5 January 2025	https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X%2825%2900522-4
[DT]	Guardian, verified Sheikh Radwan strike footage and interviews, 18 September 2026	https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/sep/18/run-get-away-witnesses-recount-israeli-double-tap-strike-that-killed-child-and-medic-ingaza
[REU]	Reuters, Nasser hospital visual investigation, 26 September 2025	https://www.reuters.com/investigations/visual-evidence-upends-israels-official-story-deadly-attack-gaza-hospital-2025-09-26/
[CPJ]	Committee to Protect Journalists, 2024 press access restriction	https://cpj.org/thetorch/2024/07/media-organizations-urge-israel-to-open-press-access-to-gaza/
[GHF]	PBS NewsHour, Aguilar aid-site video and competing accounts, 2025	https://www.pbs.org/video/hunger-in-gaza-1754081438/
[KRST]	ICTY, Prosecutor v Krstic, Appeals Judgment, 19 April 2004	https://www.icty.org/x/cases/krstic/acjug/en/krs-aj040419e.pdf
[UNCOI25]	UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry, A/HRC/60/CRP.3, 16 September 2025	https://www.un.org/unispal/document/commission-of-inquiry-report-genocide-in-gaza-a-hrc-60-crp-3/
[ICJ26]	International Court of Justice, Order of 21 May 2026 in South Africa v. Israel	https://icj-web.ileman.un-icc.cloud/sites/default/files/case-related/192/192-20260521-order-01-00-en.pdf
[ICC24]	International Criminal Court, Palestine jurisdiction challenges decision, 21 November 2024	https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/situation-state-palestine-icc-pre-trial-chamber-i-rejects-state-israels-challenges
[IDF24]	IDF Spokesperson Daniel Hagari, comments on Gaza operations, 23 May 2024	https://www.idf.il/en/mini-sites/israel-at-war/briefings-by-idf-spokesperson-bg-effie-defran/may-24-press-briefings/idf-spokesperson-radm-daniel-hagaris-comments-on-our-going-operations-in-gaza/

10. Final publication gate

- Preserve the speaker-routing and quote-fidelity warnings whenever a claim card is excerpted publicly.
- Do not present WITHDRAWN entries as errors by either speaker.
- Do not treat UNSUPPORTED or NOT ESTABLISHED as proof that the opposite proposition is true.
- For legal claims, identify the institution and procedural posture: UN Commission of Inquiry, ICC jurisdiction, ICJ provisional measures/written proceedings, or final merits judgment.
- For casualty or ratio claims, retain the date range, population, numerator, denominator and classification method.
- For strike-level claims, distinguish target allegations, operator knowledge, available precautions, proportionality and later outcome evidence.
- Do not infer intentional lying, bad faith, intelligence, competence or motive merely from an incorrect or unsupported proposition.
- Any future audio-certified transcript correction should supersede the caption-based wording where the two differ.

FINAL STATUS

Publication-ready consolidated research dossier, subject to the stated automatic-transcript / audio-certification limitation.