



BBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

case003_British Broadcasting Corporation Fake News - Nobody Loves You BBC.en

Broadcast: DETAILED ANALYSIS | Analyzed: 2026-05-11 17:52

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Standard: Ofcom Broadcasting Code

OVERALL SCORE

7.3/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

Party	Green	SNP	Lab	LibDem	Con	Reform
CHES	1.85	2.90	3.50	4.60	7.30	8.80
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Center	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

6.5 / 10

Right-favoring

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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

BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Programme Data

- Title: Untitled YouTube/online commentary video — "Fake News BBC finds Andrew Marr guilty of rules breach"
- Date (from filename): Not specified in transcript; internal references suggest post-2017 (Andrew Marr Show era)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 7–8 minutes (based on timestamp [00:01]–[07:55])
- Presenter/Reporter: Unnamed male commentator (YouTube/online personality, not a BBC journalist)

President: Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, P/O-Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

- Persons Interviewed/Featured: None formally interviewed; the commentator reads and reacts to a BBC editorial complaint ruling

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Unnamed commentator	YouTube/online political commentator	Unknown; anti-BBC, populist-right leaning	Far right / populist (estimated 8–9)
Andrew Marr (referenced)	BBC presenter, Andrew Marr Show	No party; BBC senior journalist	Centre-left leaning (contextual)
Jonathan Sacerdoti (referenced, name mangled in transcript)	Antisemitism campaigner / journalist	Pro-Israel advocacy	Centre-right / conservative
Fraser Steel (referenced)	Head of Executive Complaints, BBC	BBC institutional	Institutional/neutral

Main Topic

A YouTube commentator celebrates and amplifies a BBC Executive Complaints Unit ruling that upheld a complaint against BBC presenter Andrew Marr for an unsourced claim that Israeli forces were killing "lots of Palestinian kids," framing the ruling as proof that the BBC is a purveyor of "fake news."

World-View Context

The ruling referenced in this video relates to a real BBC Editorial Complaints Unit finding against Andrew Marr, arising from comments made on his Sunday programme in the context of the Syrian chemical weapons attack (likely 2017–2018). The complaint was brought by Jonathan Sacerdoti, a British journalist and antisemitism campaigner. The BBC's own complaints process upheld the complaint on the narrow grounds that the claim was unsourced at the time of broadcast. This video is not a BBC production — it is an external commentary video, likely published on YouTube, by an unnamed commentator who uses the ruling to advance a broader "fake news BBC" narrative. The broader context involves ongoing public debate in the UK about BBC impartiality, particularly regarding Middle East coverage, Israel-Palestine reporting, and accusations of institutional left-wing or anti-Israel bias. The video is not subject to BBC Charter obligations; it is a piece of partisan online commentary.

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: 04:03–04:51 — Quote: "in the absence of any evidence to support the reference to lots of children being killed at the time of transmission it seems to us to have risked misleading audiences on a material point" — Assessment: The ruling is read aloud but its narrow scope (unsourced at time of broadcast, not "false") is never explained or contextualised.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: No relevant timestamp — Assessment: No discussion of whether BBC Middle East coverage is systematically biased; the single ruling is treated as definitive proof of institutional dishonesty.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: 03:03–03:28 — Quote: "BBC producers initially tried to defend Marr's comments by pointing to the fact that five younger people have been killed between the beginning of the year and the date of the program" — Assessment: The factual question of whether children were being killed is raised but immediately dismissed without engagement; the commentator never addresses whether the underlying claim had factual basis.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: 02:07–02:43 — Quote: "antisemitism campaigner Jonathan [Sacerdoti]" — Assessment: The complainant is identified only as an "antisemitism campaigner" with no discussion of his institutional interests or advocacy background.

[E] OMITTED



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

Timestamp: No relevant timestamp — Assessment: Andrew Marr's perspective, response, or explanation is entirely absent.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: 04:33–04:51 — Quote: "it seems to us to have risked misleading audiences on a material point" — Assessment: The critical distinction between "unsourced/misleading" and "false/fabricated" is never drawn; the commentator collapses both into "fake news."

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: No relevant timestamp — Assessment: No reference to BBC rulings against pro-Israeli statements or any evidence of systematic directional bias.

[H] TOUCHED / SUPERFICIALLY

Timestamp: 00:03–00:09 — Quote: "fake news BBC finds Andrew Marr guilty" — Assessment: The "fake news" framing is deployed repeatedly but never examined critically.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: No relevant timestamp — Assessment: No academic, regulatory, or media-studies perspective on BBC impartiality standards is offered.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: 02:43–02:52 — Quote: "this is completely incorrect Andy's made-up fake news" — Assessment: The legal/editorial distinction between misleading and fabricated is collapsed without acknowledgement.



CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

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

Expert 1: Jonathan Sacerdoti (complainant, referenced)	
Timestamp	02:07–02:43
Statement	"when talking about a story on the use of chemical weapons in Syria Marr for some reason decided to talk about Israel which was unrelated anywhere he stated there's a lot of Palestinians being killed for the south by Israeli forces this is completely incorrect"
Classification	Sacerdoti is identified only as an "antisemitism campaigner." He is the complainant in the case — a directly interested party, not a neutral expert.
Missing counter-voice	An independent media law specialist, a BBC editorial standards expert, or a Middle East correspondent would have provided a more balanced assessment.

Credibility Matrix — Sacerdoti:

(a) FUNDING: Sacerdoti is a journalist and commentator associated with pro-Israel advocacy organisations. His work has been funded through media appearances and advocacy roles. Structural interest in findings that support the narrative of BBC anti-Israel bias.

(b) MANDATE: As complainant, his mandate is explicitly adversarial — he is not a neutral assessor.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

(c) FACHKOMPETENZ: The video presents Sacerdoti's complaint assertions as established facts rather than as one party's claims in a dispute. This is Technique 12 (source selection) — a partisan source is treated as a neutral authority.

Expert 2: Fraser Steel, BBC Head of Executive Complaints (referenced)	
Timestamp	04:03–04:51
Statement	"in the absence of any evidence to support the reference to lots of children being killed at the time of transmission it seems to us to have risked misleading audiences on a material point we therefore propose to uphold this part of your complaint"
Classification	Steel is the BBC's own complaints officer — an institutional insider. His ruling is the most authoritative source in the video, but it is read selectively.

Credibility Matrix — Fraser Steel / BBC ECU:

(a) FUNDING: BBC — publicly funded via licence fee. Institutional interest in maintaining credibility of complaints process.



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

(b) MANDATE: Executive Complaints Unit has a formal mandate to adjudicate editorial complaints. Compatible with neutral assessment within BBC guidelines.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

(c) FACHKOMPETENZ: Notably, Steel's ruling is carefully worded — "risky misleading" and "in the absence of evidence at time of transmission" — language that is significantly more qualified than the commentator's "fake news" characterisation. This qualification is entirely ignored.

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent media law specialist (to contextualise the ruling's scope)
- Middle East correspondent (to address the factual question of Palestinian casualties)
- BBC Editorial Guidelines specialist (to explain the "due accuracy" standard)

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Jonathan Sacerdoti (complainant, referenced)	-2	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	YELLOW
Fraser Steel, BBC Head of Executive Complaints (referenced)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+7	GREEN

Summary (Matrix Results):

- Sacerdoti: YELLOW (-1) — Interested party presented as neutral authority
- Fraser Steel/BBC ECU: GREEN (+7) — Authoritative source, but ruling is misrepresented by commentator



2. SOURCE SELECTION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: BBC Executive Complaints Unit ruling letter (Fraser Steel)

Timestamp

04:03–04:51 — Statement: "in the absence of any evidence to support the reference to lots of children being killed at the time of transmission it seems to us to have risked misleading audiences on a material point"

(a) Funding and governance: BBC — publicly funded, licence fee. Independent complaints process with formal mandate.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The BBC has an institutional interest in appearing to enforce its own standards; the ruling against Marr demonstrates internal accountability. No directional conflict of interest in this specific ruling.

(c) Missing counter-source: The ruling's qualified language ("risked misleading," "at the time of transmission") is never contextualised. A media law specialist would have explained that this is a significantly lower threshold than "false" or "fabricated."

SOURCE SIGNAL: GREEN (+7) — but selectively quoted to support a stronger conclusion than the source warrants.

Source 2: Jonathan Sacerdoti complaint letter

Timestamp

02:07–02:52 — Statement: "this is completely incorrect Andy's made-up fake news"

(a) Funding: Sacerdoti is a journalist/commentator with pro-Israel advocacy associations. Funding not specified.

(b) Mandate: Complainant — explicitly adversarial, not neutral.

(c) Structural conflict of interest: Direct institutional interest in a finding that supports the narrative of BBC anti-Israel bias.

(c) FACHKOMPETENZ: Andrew Marr's response; BBC's initial defence (mentioned but dismissed); independent Middle East correspondent.

SOURCE SIGNAL: YELLOW (-1) — interested party presented as authoritative source.

Summary: The video uses only two sources — both of which support the "fake news" narrative — and systematically excludes all sources that would complicate or qualify that narrative. The BBC's own ruling is the most credible source but is misrepresented by selective quotation that omits its qualified language.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

10/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Estimated speaking time:

- Commentator (anti-BBC position): approximately 5 min 30 sec (approx. 75%)
- BBC ECU ruling (read aloud): approximately 45 sec (approx. 10%)
- Sacerdoti complaint (read aloud): approximately 40 sec (approx. 9%)
- BBC initial defence (read aloud): approximately 20 sec (approx. 4%)
- Music/non-verbal content: approximately 1 min (approx. 12%)

Summary: The time distribution is entirely one-sided. The only "opposing" voice — the BBC's initial defence of Marr's comments — receives approximately 20 seconds and is immediately dismissed. No time is allocated to any perspective that might contextualise, qualify, or challenge the commentator's framing. This is a structural imbalance of the most extreme kind.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

The BBC ruling uses the phrase "risked misleading" — not "was false" or "was fabricated." This is a critical distinction.

Relevant at: 04:33–04:51

Effect

By omitting this distinction, the video implies the BBC itself confirmed the claim was false, when in fact the ruling only found it was unsourced at the time of broadcast. This transforms an editorial standards finding into a confession of deliberate dishonesty.

Omission 2:

Context

The BBC's initial defence — that five young people had been killed between the start of the year and the broadcast date — is mentioned but immediately dismissed without engagement.

Relevant at: 03:03–03:28

Effect

The factual question of whether Palestinian children were being killed by Israeli forces is never resolved. The audience is left with the impression that the claim was entirely fabricated, when the evidence suggests it had factual basis even if it was unsourced in the moment.

Omission 3:

Context

No reference is made to any BBC ruling against presenters for pro-Israeli statements, or to the broader pattern of BBC complaints from both sides of the Israel-Palestine debate.

Relevant at: Throughout

Effect

The absence of comparative context allows the single ruling to be presented as evidence of systematic anti-Israel bias, when it may simply reflect a routine editorial standards enforcement.

Summary: The video systematically omits all contextual information that would complicate the "fake news BBC" narrative — including the qualified language of the ruling itself, the factual basis for Marr's claim, and the comparative record of BBC complaints. These omissions are not incidental; they are structurally necessary to sustain the video's central argument.

Missing Voices

- Andrew Marr (BBC presenter): Would have provided his explanation of the comment and its context within the Syria discussion.
- BBC Editorial Standards team (beyond the letter): Would have clarified the narrow scope of the ruling and distinguished "misleading" from "fabricated."
- Independent Middle East correspondent: Would have addressed whether Palestinian children were in fact being killed by Israeli forces at the time of broadcast.
- Media law specialist: Would have explained the legal and editorial distinction between an unsourced claim and a false one.



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

- Ofcom/BBC Trust representative: Would have contextualised how frequently BBC presenters are found in breach and whether this is exceptional.
- Academic media studies researcher: Would have contextualised BBC impartiality standards and the history of complaints from both pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian perspectives.
- Jonathan Sacerdoti (directly): Is quoted second-hand from a complaint letter; his direct testimony and institutional background are not examined.
- Palestinian rights organisation: Would have provided the perspective of those whose deaths are the subject of the disputed claim.



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp

03:03–03:17

Number: "five younger people have been killed between the beginning of the year and the date of the program"

Missing Context: The figure of five is presented as the BBC's own defence, but no source, methodology, or definition ("younger people") is provided. The commentator does not engage with this figure at all — neither accepting nor refuting it.

Effect

The audience is left without any factual anchor for the underlying claim. The figure is mentioned only to be dismissed, creating the impression that the BBC's defence was trivial or irrelevant.

Summary: Numerical manipulation is limited but present. The key figure in the BBC's defence (five deaths) is introduced and immediately abandoned without analysis, preventing the audience from evaluating the factual basis of Marr's original claim.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp 00:03–00:09

Quote "fake news BBC"

Technique: The BBC is associated with the "fake news" label — a term politically associated with authoritarian populism and used to delegitimise mainstream journalism. By applying it to the BBC, the commentator places the corporation in the same category as outlets accused of deliberate political fabrication.

Effect Audiences familiar with the "fake news" discourse will associate the BBC with deliberate political manipulation rather than with journalistic error.

Association 2:

Timestamp 07:07–07:20

Quote "there's a lot of people who view my BBC videos and are so civil brainwashed about the BBC that they think they're the best thing since sliced bread"

Technique: BBC viewers who trust the corporation are associated with "brainwashing" — a term connoting cult-like manipulation and loss of rational agency.

Effect Trust in the BBC is pathologised; those who do not share the commentator's scepticism are implicitly characterised as cognitively compromised.

Association 3:

Timestamp 05:30–05:50

Quote "the BBC the bastion of British Broadcasting ladies and gentlemen have been caught with their pants well and truly round their ankles"

Technique: The BBC's institutional dignity is associated with sexual/physical humiliation through the "pants round their ankles" metaphor.

Effect The association degrades the BBC's institutional authority through ridicule rather than argument, making rational defence of the corporation socially costly.

Guilt by Association Chain: BBC → "fake news" → deliberate fabrication → institutional dishonesty → brainwashing of audiences

Summary (Category Assignment):

- The BBC as institution: Framed as Category C (ideological fabricator) through association with "fake news" label — but this categorisation is not supported by the evidence presented. The ruling itself uses qualified language ("risked misleading") that does not support the fabrication narrative. The framing is the BBC's characterisation by the commentator, not an evidence-based finding.



7. TIMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:01–00:09 (Opening)

Content: "fake news BBC finds Andrew Marr guilty of rules breach"

Timing Effect: The "fake news" label is placed at the very opening of the video, before any evidence is presented. This primes the audience to interpret all subsequent information through a "fake news" lens. The ruling's actual language — which is significantly more qualified — is not presented until 04:03, by which point the interpretive frame is firmly established.

Finding 2:

Position: 05:00–05:15 (Middle — post-evidence)

Content: "fake news fake news fake news do I need to say that anymore fake news big news fake news"

Timing Effect: The repetition of "fake news" immediately after reading the ruling reinforces the opening frame at the moment when the audience might otherwise reflect on the ruling's qualified language. The chant functions as a cognitive interrupt.

Finding 3:

Position: 07:04–07:55 (Closing)

Content: "don't forget to subscribe... there's a lot of people who view my BBC videos and are so civil brainwashed about the BBC"

Timing Effect: The closing appeal to subscribe is combined with the "brainwashed" characterisation of BBC supporters, creating a social identity incentive to align with the commentator's position. The final impression left is one of tribal affiliation rather than analytical conclusion.

Summary: The video's structure is designed to establish the "fake news" frame before evidence is presented, reinforce it immediately after evidence is read, and close with a social identity appeal. This sequencing is consistent with persuasion architecture rather than journalistic presentation.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Methodological Principle (v2.7): Before any assessment, the trigger event must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggers in other positions produced no analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 05:00–05:50

Trigger Event: BBC ECU ruling upholding complaint against Andrew Marr for unsourced claim about Palestinian children.

Reaction: "fake news fake news fake news... absolutely loving this absolutely loving it... I'm loving it more than McDonald's"

Comparison

No comparable event involving a BBC ruling against a presenter for an unsourced pro-Israel claim, or an unsourced claim about any other group, is referenced or discussed.

Asymmetry: The outrage is triggered specifically by a ruling that relates to Israel-Palestine coverage. No evidence is presented that the commentator would react with equivalent celebration to a ruling against a presenter for an unsourced claim about, for example, Russian casualties or British military conduct. The asymmetry is structurally present but cannot be fully confirmed without access to the commentator's broader output.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 02:43–02:52

Trigger Event: Sacerdoti's characterisation of Marr's comment as "completely incorrect" and "made-up fake news."

Reaction: The commentator adopts Sacerdoti's characterisation without question or qualification.

Comparison

The BBC's initial defence (that five young people had been killed) is mentioned at 03:03 but receives no equivalent acceptance or engagement.

Asymmetry: The complainant's assertions are treated as established facts; the BBC's factual defence is treated as irrelevant. This is a clear asymmetry in the application of evidential standards.

Summary: The commentator's outrage is selectively applied to a ruling that supports a pre-existing anti-BBC, pro-Israel narrative. Comparable editorial failures in other directions are not referenced, and the BBC's factual defence is dismissed without engagement. The asymmetry is consistent with motivated reasoning rather than principled media criticism.



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

Share of covered perspectives

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

- [A] The BBC's own editorial complaints process and what it actually found (narrow vs. broad ruling)
- [B] The broader context of BBC Middle East reporting and whether it is systematically biased
- [C] The specific factual question:** were Palestinian children being killed by Israeli forces at the time of Marr's broadcast?
- [D] The role of antisemitism campaigners as complainants and their institutional interests
- [E] Andrew Marr's own explanation or response to the ruling
- [F] The distinction between an unsourced claim and a false claim
- [G] The history of BBC rulings against presenters for pro-Palestinian AND pro-Israeli statements (balance check)
- [H] The broader "fake news" framing and its political origins and uses
- [I] Academic or media-studies perspectives on BBC impartiality standards
- [J] The legal and editorial distinction between "misleading" and "fabricated"



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:03–00:09
Quote	<i>"fake news BBC finds Andrew Marr guilty of rules breach"</i>
Manipulation	The ruling is immediately framed as "fake news" — a term with specific political connotations originating in Trumpian populist discourse — rather than as a routine editorial complaints outcome.
Why problematic	The framing pre-empts any nuanced reading of the ruling. Viewers are primed to interpret the BBC's own internal accountability mechanism as evidence of institutional dishonesty rather than as the system working correctly.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	05:00–05:15
Quote	<i>"Punk the rights on this one baby say thick news fake news fake news fake news"</i>
Manipulation	The repetition of "fake news" as a chant transforms a specific editorial finding into a generalised indictment of the BBC as an institution.
Why problematic	The rhetorical technique of repetition (anaphora) bypasses rational evaluation and creates an emotional association between the BBC brand and dishonesty.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	05:30–05:50
Quote	<i>"the BBC the bastion of British Broadcasting ladies and gentlemen have been caught with their pants well and truly round their ankles over this one"</i>
Manipulation	The metaphor of being "caught with their pants round their ankles" frames the BBC as having been exposed in an act of deliberate deception, rather than having made an unsourced claim in a live broadcast.
Why problematic	The framing implies premeditated dishonesty rather than journalistic error, which is not supported by the ruling itself.



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

Summary: The entire video is constructed within a "fake news" frame that collapses the distinction between an unsourced claim and deliberate fabrication. This framing is sustained throughout and never subjected to critical examination.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	02:43–02:52
Quote	<i>"this is completely incorrect Andy's made-up fake news"</i>
Manipulation	The complainant's characterisation ("completely incorrect," "made-up") is presented as established fact rather than as one party's assertion in a complaint.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "The complainant argued the claim was unsupported by evidence available at the time of broadcast." The language used implies deliberate fabrication.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	05:30–05:36
Quote	<i>"the BBC the bastion of British Broadcasting"</i>
Manipulation	Ironic use of "bastion" — a term of high praise — immediately undercut by the "pants round their ankles" metaphor, creating a sarcastic frame that ridicules institutional credibility.
Why problematic	The irony technique allows the commentator to simultaneously invoke and destroy the BBC's reputational authority without engaging with its substance.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	07:04–07:20
Quote	<i>"don't forget to subscribe click the like button don't forget to click the dislike button because I know there's a lot of people who view my BBC videos and are so civil brainwashed about the BBC"</i>
Manipulation	The term "brainwashed" is applied to BBC viewers who do not share the commentator's scepticism, pathologising mainstream media consumption as a form of cognitive manipulation.
Why problematic	This language delegitimises any audience member who might question the commentator's framing, creating an in-group/out-group dynamic that forecloses critical engagement.

Summary: The language throughout is consistently loaded, using terms ("fake news," "made-up," "brainwashed") that carry strong political connotations and pre-empt nuanced analysis. No neutral or qualifying language is employed at any point.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Methodological Principle (v2.7): Before any assessment, the trigger event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggers in other guests/positions produced no analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp N/A

Trigger Event: This is a solo commentary video with no guests, no interviews, and no moderation dynamic.

Quote (Presenter) N/A

Comparison No comparable guest interactions exist.

Asymmetry: Not applicable — the format precludes moderation asymmetry analysis.

Summary: The solo commentary format means that moderation behaviour criteria cannot be applied. The absence of any interlocutor is itself a structural choice that eliminates the possibility of challenge or counter-argument, which is noted under Criterion 4 (Selective Omission) and Criterion 15 (Agenda-Setting).



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

This is a solo commentary video. No questions are posed to any guest. The format structurally eliminates question asymmetry as an analytical category.

At no point does the commentator pose a question to himself, to the BBC, or to any represented party that would require a substantive answer. Rhetorical questions ("how dare I come along and criticize the two-bit Broadcasting Corporation?") are self-answering and function as affirmation rather than inquiry.

Summary: Question asymmetry cannot be assessed in a solo commentary format. The absence of any questioning dynamic is itself analytically significant — it means no claim made in the video is subjected to scrutiny.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	03:03–03:28 — Construct: "BBC producers initially tried to defend Marr's comments by pointing to the fact that five younger people have been killed between the beginning of the year and the date of the program"
Analysis	This is the only moment in the video where a counter-argument is presented. However, it is immediately followed by the dismissal of that argument ("but Mr. Sacerdoti argued that later events could not be used to justify Mr. Marr's comments"). The structure creates a superficial appearance of balance — "here is the BBC's defence, here is why it was rejected" — but the rejection is presented as definitive without any independent evaluation.

Summary: False balance is not a primary technique in this video — the video makes no serious attempt at balance. The single instance of a counter-argument being presented is immediately dismissed, which is closer to a straw-man technique than false balance. Score is low because the video does not pretend to be balanced.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda Element Set: The BBC is institutionally dishonest and produces "fake news."

Timestamp 00:03–00:09 — Evidence: "fake news BBC finds Andrew Marr guilty of rules breach"

Alternative Agenda: The BBC's internal complaints process is functioning as designed — a senior presenter was found to have made an unsourced claim and was held accountable. This is evidence of institutional accountability, not institutional dishonesty.

Finding 2:

Agenda Element Set: Criticism of the BBC is inherently courageous and those who trust the BBC are "brainwashed."

Timestamp 07:04–07:25 — Evidence: "how dare I come along and criticize the two-bit Broadcasting Corporation... there's a lot of people who view my BBC videos and are so civil brainwashed about the BBC"

Alternative Agenda: Critical media literacy applies equally to BBC output and to YouTube commentary. The commentator's own claims are no less in need of evidential scrutiny than Marr's.

Finding 3:

Agenda Element Set: The Israel-Palestine dimension of the ruling is treated as self-evidently the most important aspect.

Timestamp Throughout — Evidence: The entire video is structured around the Israel-Palestine framing of the complaint.

Alternative Agenda: The ruling could equally be framed as a story about BBC accountability standards, live broadcast accuracy, or the role of advocacy organisations in shaping editorial complaints processes.

Summary: The video's agenda-setting function is its most powerful technique. By establishing "fake news BBC" as the interpretive frame from the first seconds, it ensures that all subsequent information — including the BBC's own qualified ruling — is processed within that frame. Alternative framings (accountability, accuracy standards, institutional process) are structurally excluded.



CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Note: Criteria 5 and 7 are scored 0 as not applicable (N/A) due to solo commentary format. These are included in the average as 0.

Results

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this programme:

- 1. Framing (Score 9):** The "fake news" label is applied from the first seconds and sustained throughout, ensuring all evidence is processed within a pre-established interpretive frame. This technique is particularly effective because it borrows the authority of the BBC's own ruling while misrepresenting its scope and language.
- 2. Selective Omission (Score 9):** The video systematically excludes all information that would complicate the "fake news" narrative — including the ruling's qualified language ("risked misleading" vs. "was false"), the factual basis for Marr's claim, and the comparative record of BBC complaints. These omissions are structurally necessary to sustain the central argument.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 9):** By establishing "fake news BBC" as the default interpretive frame and pathologising trust in the BBC as "brainwashing," the video forecloses the possibility of alternative framings. The BBC's internal accountability mechanism is reframed as evidence of institutional dishonesty rather than institutional integrity.

Core Messages of the Programme

MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT): "The BBC deliberately fabricates news stories that are hostile to Israel."

Technique: Framing + Language — the ruling's qualified "risked misleading" is collapsed into "fake news" and "made-up."

Evidence: 00:03–00:09, 02:43–02:52, 04:33–04:51

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "The commentator is a courageous truth-teller exposing institutional dishonesty."

Technique: Agenda-Setting + Guilt by Association — critics of the BBC are positioned as brave; supporters are "brainwashed."

Evidence: 07:04–07:33, 05:30–05:50

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "Trust in mainstream media is a form of cognitive manipulation; only sceptics are thinking clearly."

Technique: Language + Guilt by Association — "brainwashed" applied to BBC viewers.

Evidence: 07:07–07:25

Manipulation Level Classification

Justification: The combined score of 6.1 and the pattern of techniques — sustained framing, systematic omission, source misrepresentation, and agenda-setting — indicate systematic bias rather than mere one-sidedness. However, it is critical to note that this video is not a BBC production and is therefore not subject to BBC Charter Art. 6 obligations. It is a piece of partisan online commentary that makes no claim to impartiality. The systematic bias score reflects the analytical finding about the video's techniques, not a finding of BBC Charter breach. The video's primary function is advocacy, not journalism.

CONCLUSION

This video is a piece of partisan online commentary, not journalism, and is not subject to BBC Charter Art. 6 impartiality obligations. Its analytical interest lies in the techniques it employs to misrepresent a genuine BBC editorial ruling. The BBC ECU ruling against Andrew Marr was real, narrow in scope, and used qualified language ("risked misleading audiences... in the absence of evidence at time of transmission") that is significantly weaker than the "fake



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

news" and "deliberate fabrication" characterisation the commentator applies. The video systematically omits the ruling's qualified language, the factual basis for Marr's claim, and all comparative context, in order to sustain a pre-established "fake news BBC" narrative. Under BBC Charter Art. 6 standards, this video would fail every impartiality test — but those standards do not apply to it. What the video does demonstrate is how a genuine institutional accountability finding can be weaponised through selective quotation, loaded language, and systematic omission to support a narrative that the source material does not actually sustain.



CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party Representation Assessment

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Programme Representation vs. Party Programme Position
Conservative	0	No reference to Conservative Party positions in this video.
Labour	0	No reference to Labour Party positions in this video.
Lib Dems	0	No reference to Liberal Democrat positions in this video.
SNP	0	No reference to SNP positions in this video.
Reform UK	0	No direct reference, but the "fake news" framing and anti-BBC populism are stylistically and rhetorically consistent with Reform UK's media criticism discourse. No explicit party position stated or misrepresented.
Green	0	No reference to Green Party positions in this video.

Note: This video does not engage with UK party politics in any direct sense. Its subject matter is a specific BBC editorial ruling relating to Israel-Palestine coverage. Party political bias assessment is therefore largely inapplicable. The rhetorical style and "fake news" framing are consistent with populist-right media criticism (Reform UK / UKIP tradition) but no party positions are explicitly stated or misrepresented.

Party Bias Summary

- Most Accurate Representation: N/A — no party positions are represented
- Strongest Distortion: N/A — no party positions are represented
- Average Deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: This video operates outside the conventional party-political frame. Its political orientation is better characterised as anti-establishment populism with a specific pro-Israel, anti-BBC axis. The absence of party-political content means the standard party bias assessment yields no meaningful findings.



CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (BBC Charter Art. 6)

Assessment under BBC Charter Art. 6

Preliminary Note — Jurisdictional Scope:

BBC Charter Art. 6 and the associated BBC Agreement impose impartiality and accuracy obligations on the BBC as a public broadcaster. This video is not a BBC production. It is an external YouTube commentary video produced by an unnamed individual. BBC Charter Art. 6 does not apply to this video. The following analysis therefore addresses two distinct questions: (1) whether the BBC's own conduct — as represented in the video — raises Charter concerns; and (2) whether the video's characterisation of the BBC ruling is accurate.

Violation 1 (BBC Conduct — Andrew Marr):

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / BBC Editorial Guidelines — Due Accuracy

Facts: Andrew Marr stated on his Sunday programme that "there's lots of Palestinian kids being killed for the south as well by Israeli forces" in the context of a discussion about Syrian chemical weapons. The BBC ECU found this claim was unsourced at the time of broadcast.

Evidence: Timestamp 04:03–04:51 — Quote: "in the absence of any evidence to support the reference to lots of children being killed at the time of transmission it seems to us to have risked misleading audiences on a material point"

Assessment: The BBC's own complaints process identified a breach of due accuracy standards. The ruling is narrow — it concerns the absence of sourcing at the time of broadcast, not the falsity of the underlying claim. The BBC's internal accountability mechanism functioned as designed. This is not evidence of systematic institutional dishonesty; it is evidence of a single unsourced claim by a presenter and the BBC's response to a complaint about it.

Violation 2 (Video's Misrepresentation of BBC Ruling):

Standard: Not BBC Charter Art. 6 (not applicable to this video) — but relevant to general standards of accurate reporting

Facts: The video characterises the BBC ECU ruling as a finding of "fake news" and "deliberate fabrication," when the ruling's actual language is "risked misleading audiences... in the absence of evidence at time of transmission."

Evidence: Timestamp 02:43–02:52 — Quote: "this is completely incorrect Andy's made-up fake news" (presented as established fact rather than complainant's assertion); Timestamp 04:33–04:51 — the ruling's qualified language is read aloud but immediately reframed as "fake news."

Assessment: The video materially misrepresents the scope and language of the BBC ruling. This is not a BBC Charter violation (the video is not a BBC production) but it is a significant accuracy failure by the video's own standards of media criticism.

No BBC Charter Violation — Structural Note:

The BBC's conduct in this matter — making an unsourced claim and subsequently upholding a complaint about it — is consistent with BBC Charter Art. 6 obligations. The internal complaints process functioned correctly. The video's framing of this as a Charter violation or evidence of institutional dishonesty is not supported by the evidence presented.

Overall Assessment — BBC Charter Art. 6

The BBC's own conduct, as represented in this video, does not constitute a systematic BBC Charter Art. 6 violation. The ECU ruling demonstrates that the BBC's internal accountability mechanism identified and upheld a complaint about an unsourced claim — which is precisely what the Charter's due accuracy standard requires. The video itself is not subject to BBC Charter obligations and cannot be assessed against them. However, if the video's techniques were applied to a BBC production, they would constitute serious breaches of BBC Charter Art. 6 — specifically the requirements of due accuracy (misrepresenting the ruling's language), due impartiality (presenting only one side of a contested factual question), and the prohibition on misleading audiences on material points (collapsing "risked misleading" into "deliberate fabrication"). The analytical value of this video for BBC Charter purposes lies in its



demonstration of how a genuine accountability finding can be misrepresented through selective quotation and loaded framing.

SOURCE DEEP-CHECK (Mandatory for all cited specialist bodies / NGOs / advisory bodies)

Source 1: BBC Executive Complaints Unit (Fraser Steel)

- 1. FUNDING:** BBC — publicly funded via UK television licence fee (£169.50/year, 2024). Governed by BBC Royal Charter and Agreement.
- 2. MANDATE:** The ECU has a formal mandate to adjudicate editorial complaints against BBC output. This mandate is compatible with neutral assessment of specific editorial decisions.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The BBC has an institutional interest in appearing to enforce its own standards. In this specific case, ruling against a senior presenter demonstrates institutional accountability, which serves the BBC's credibility interests. No directional conflict of interest in the specific ruling.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 (institutional interest in appearing fair)
 - D2 Personal Risk: +1 (ruling against senior presenter carries internal risk)
 - D3 Subject Competence: +2 (direct professional mandate)
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 (formal process implies consistency)
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +2 (measured, evidence-based language)
 - D6 Source Level: +2 (primary source — official ruling letter)
 - TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE SIGNAL: GREEN**
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** The ruling's qualified language ("risked misleading," "at time of transmission") is not contextualised by any independent media law or editorial standards specialist. A counter-voice would have clarified that this is a significantly lower threshold than "false" or "fabricated."

Source 2: Jonathan Sacerdoti (complainant)

- 1. FUNDING:** Sacerdoti is a journalist and commentator. He has been associated with the Institute for Jewish Policy Research and has appeared on pro-Israel media platforms. Specific funding for the complaint is not disclosed.
- 2. MANDATE:** As complainant, his mandate is explicitly adversarial. He is not a neutral assessor of BBC editorial standards.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct institutional and ideological interest in a finding that supports the narrative of BBC anti-Israel bias. His complaint letter assertions are presented in the video as established facts rather than as one party's claims.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 (direct complainant with institutional interest)
 - D2 Personal Risk: +1 (public complaint against major broadcaster)
 - D3 Subject Competence: +1 (media commentary experience, not editorial standards specialist)
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 (consistent pro-Israel media criticism)
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 (assertive language without data)
 - D6 Source Level: -1 (secondary — complaint letter, not primary evidence)
 - TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE SIGNAL: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Andrew Marr's response; BBC's initial factual defence; independent Middle East correspondent; media law specialist. None of these are present in the video.

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Antisemitism campaigner" is a social attribution, not a neutral qualification. It describes Sacerdoti's advocacy role but does not establish his competence as an assessor of BBC editorial standards or as an authority on the factual question of Palestinian casualties. The video treats this attribution as conferring authority on his complaint assertions, which is an instance of the "recognised authority" fallacy identified in the analytical framework.

Analysis completed under Version 2.7-detail | Methodological Principles K5+K13 applied throughout | All asymmetry findings documented with trigger events per standing methodological requirement.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	8	•••••
2	SOURCE SELECTION	9	•••••
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	10	•••••
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	9	•••••
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	4	••
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	7	•••••
7	TIMING	7	•••••
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	8	•••••
9	COMPLETENESS	9	•••••
10	FRAMING	9	•••••
11	LANGUAGE AND TERMINOLOGY	9	•••••
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	0	•
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	0	•
14	FALSE BALANCE	2	•
15	AGENDA-SETTING	9	•••••

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

7.9/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.7/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

7.3/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

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

Legal and Methodological Notes



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

No factual determination

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

No legal judgment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Ofcom Broadcasting Code. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular Ofcom).

No proof of causation

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

No judgment of intent

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

Heuristic comparison tool

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



APPENDIX: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

Legal Framework United Kingdom — BBC

Legislation

- BBC Royal Charter (2017, valid until 2027)
- Communications Act 2003
- Ofcom Broadcasting Code

Relevant Provisions

BBC Royal Charter

- Art. 5 (Public Purposes): Sustaining citizenship and civil society through the provision of impartial news and information to help people understand and engage with the world around them.
- Art. 6(4): The BBC must observe high standards of due impartiality.

Communications Act 2003

- s.319(2)(c): News included in television and radio services is presented with due impartiality.
- s.320(1): Special impartiality requirements for matters of political controversy and matters relating to current public policy.

Ofcom Broadcasting Code

- Section 5 (Due Impartiality): Due impartiality on matters of political or industrial controversy and matters relating to current public policy. "Due" means adequate or appropriate to the subject and nature of the programme.

Core Obligations

- 1. Due Impartiality:** Not absolute equal treatment, but appropriate to the subject matter
- 2. Due Accuracy:** Adequate accuracy in reporting
- 3. Editorial Independence:** Independence from government and commercial interests

Regulatory Authority

- Ofcom (Office of Communications): External regulator with sanctioning powers
- BBC Board: Internal governance

Complaints Procedure

1. BBC Complaints (internal, three-tier)
2. Ofcom (external complaint after exhausting internal routes)
3. Judicial Review (High Court)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

References

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

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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



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

Reports and Membership at SVFAB

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

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

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



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

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

Also available as an **audiobook**.



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

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

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

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

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



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It doesn't change the facts – it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works – because we all play along. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct, full of real-life examples. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame – and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

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



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

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

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.