



## BBC DETAILED ANALYSIS

case011\_Producer behind Gaza documentary reveals BBC's 'failings' / LBC.en

Broadcast: COMPLETE DETAIL ANALYSIS | Analyzed: 2026-05-11 18:24

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**6.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

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

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.5 / 10**

*Left-favoring*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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

## BROADCAST INFO AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: Untitled segment (likely GB News or similar UK news channel — context clues: "the beeb," Channel 4 references, UK political framing)
- Date: Not specified in transcript filename
- Estimated Length: Approximately 6–7 minutes (based on timestamp 00:00–06:42)

**President:** Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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

- Presenter/Reporter: Unnamed presenter (referred to as interviewer throughout)
- Persons Interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Ben Dear	Founder, Basement Films; former Channel 4 News editor	Independent / journalism sector	Centre-left (media establishment)
Presenter	TV news anchor/interviewer	Unknown / likely GB News	Centre-right (GB News typical positioning)

## Main Topic

A documentary filmmaker alleges that the BBC deliberately suppressed his Gaza medical documentary ("Doctors Under Attack") due to institutional mismanagement, political sensitivity, and the fallout from a separate controversy involving another BBC film narrated by the son of a Hamas official.

## World-View Context

The BBC's handling of Gaza-related journalism has been a major flashpoint in UK media since October 7, 2023. Two broad camps exist: those who argue the BBC has been insufficiently critical of Israeli military actions (including many journalists, NGOs, and pro-Palestinian advocacy groups), and those who argue the BBC has shown institutional bias against Israel and has been infiltrated by activist journalism (including pro-Israel lobby groups, Conservative politicians, and some media critics). The suppression of the documentary "Doctors Under Attack" — later broadcast by Channel 4 — became a specific case study in BBC editorial decision-making under political pressure. The broader context includes the BBC's Charter renewal in 2027, ongoing Ofcom scrutiny, and the "How to Survive a War Zone" controversy involving a narrator with Hamas family connections. This segment sits within a wider debate about BBC institutional integrity, editorial independence, and whether political lobbying — from any direction — distorts public broadcasting.

## Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — the BBC's own editorial justification is never presented directly. The presenter summarises it dismissively at 05:28 ("The BBC, I know, will say...") but this is filtered through the guest's characterisation, not a BBC spokesperson.

Assessment: The BBC's institutional voice is entirely absent; its position is paraphrased by its critic.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — internal BBC editorial debate is referenced only obliquely at 04:08 ("this compliance was deeply worrying throughout") without any internal BBC voice being heard.

Assessment: No BBC editor, journalist, or compliance officer is given airtime.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — the Israeli government's position on the documentary's claims (targeted assassinations of medics, hospital bombings) is never sought or mentioned.

Assessment: A significant omission given the documentary makes serious allegations against Israeli military conduct.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — the doctors and medics featured are described at 04:53 but their accounts are not independently verified within the segment.

Assessment: The factual basis of the documentary's claims is assumed rather than examined.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: 05:45 — "very strong lobbying from groups within their staff and and from outside of the building" — mentioned but unnamed and unexamined.



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

Assessment: Lobby groups are referenced but not identified, questioned, or given a voice.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — Ofcom's regulatory role is never mentioned.

Assessment: The relevant regulatory framework is entirely absent.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — Channel 4's decision to broadcast the film is mentioned at 00:18 but their compliance process is never explored.

Assessment: A directly relevant comparator institution is ignored.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — no independent media ethics expert is consulted.

Assessment: The segment lacks any neutral analytical framework for evaluating editorial delay.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: No timestamp — Palestinian advocacy perspectives are absent.

Assessment: The political context of the documentary's subject matter is not examined.

[J] SUGGESTED / HINTED

Timestamp: 03:38 — "we are going to delay your film because of the Johnson report"

Assessment: The Johnson Report is mentioned as a causal factor but its actual findings are never explained to the audience.



## CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

**7/10**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**Expert 1:** Ben Dear — Founder, Basement Films; former Channel 4 News editor

<b>Timestamp</b>	00:18 onwards
<b>Statement</b>	"The BBC never told us that they hadn't approved the film. They approved it at many different levels and they all they ever said about the film was this was a vital piece of public interest journalism."
<b>Classification</b>	Dear is the producer of the suppressed documentary — he is a direct party to the dispute, with a clear financial and reputational interest in the film being broadcast and the BBC being seen as having acted wrongly.

#### Source Depth Check:

- (a) FUNDING:** Basement Films is a commercial independent production company. Dear has a direct financial interest in the documentary being broadcast and in the BBC being seen as having wrongly suppressed it. His company's reputation and future commissioning relationships are affected by the outcome of this dispute.
- (b) MANDATE:** As the documentary's producer, Dear's mandate is explicitly to advocate for his film. He is not a neutral observer of BBC editorial processes.
- (c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6 Dimensions, -2 to +2):**
- (c) FACHKOMPETENZ:** a structurally partisan source is framed as a credible independent witness.

#### Missing Expert Groups:

- A BBC editorial compliance expert or former BBC editor who could explain the institutional logic of the delay
- An independent media law specialist who could assess whether the BBC's conduct was within or outside normal editorial practice
- A conflict journalism academic who could contextualise the documentary's claims about Gaza medics

#### Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Ben Dear — Founder, Basement Films; former Channel 4 News editor	-2	+1	+1	0	-1	-1	-2	<b>YELLOW</b>

*Summary (Matrix Result):*

Expert	Traffic Light	Key Issue
--------	---------------	-----------

**President:** Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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

Ben Dear

YELLOW (-2)

Direct financial/reputational conflict of interest; framed as neutral witness



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Ben Deair / Basement Films

#### Timestamp

00:18 onwards — Statement: "we started making this we developed this idea with Channel 4 first of all last year"

**(a) Funding and governance:** Commercial independent production company; revenue dependent on documentary commissions from broadcasters including the BBC and Channel 4. Direct financial interest in the outcome of this dispute.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Deair benefits professionally and financially from the BBC being seen as having wrongly suppressed his film. His account of events cannot be treated as neutral testimony.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** A BBC editorial spokesperson, the Johnson Report itself, or an independent media ethics expert would provide the necessary counterbalance.

### Source 2: The Johnson Report (referenced but not cited)

#### Timestamp

03:38 — "we are going to delay your film because of the Johnson report"

**(a) Funding and governance:** The Johnson Report is an internal BBC investigation — its findings, scope, and conclusions are never explained to the audience.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** The report is invoked as a causal explanation for the delay but its actual content is withheld from the audience, making it impossible to assess whether the BBC's invocation of it was legitimate.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** The report itself, or a summary of its findings, would allow viewers to assess the BBC's stated rationale.

*Summary: The segment relies on a single, conflicted source (Deair) and references a second source (the Johnson Report) without explaining its content. No independent, neutral, or BBC-aligned source is consulted. This is a structurally deficient source selection that violates the BBC Charter's due impartiality standard — and is particularly notable given that the subject of the segment is the BBC's own editorial conduct.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Ben Dear (guest/filmmaker): approximately 4 min 30 sec (approx. 68%)
- Presenter: approximately 2 min (approx. 30%)
- BBC voice: 0 minutes (0%)
- Any other perspective: 0 minutes (0%)

*Summary: The time distribution reflects a standard one-on-one interview format, which is not inherently problematic. However, the complete absence of any BBC voice, regulatory perspective, or counterbalancing viewpoint means that 100% of substantive content comes from a single, conflicted source. The format itself is not the problem; the absence of balance within it is.*



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

The BBC's own stated reasons for the delay — beyond Deair's characterisation — are never presented. The Johnson Report's actual findings are never explained.

Relevant at: 03:38 — "we are going to delay your film because of the Johnson report"

###### Effect

Viewers cannot assess whether the BBC's invocation of the Johnson Report was a legitimate editorial reason or a pretext. The omission makes the BBC's position appear indefensible by default.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

The documentary's specific claims — "Israeli targeted assassinations," hospital bombings, detention and torture of medics — are never independently verified or contextualised.

Relevant at: 04:53–05:10 — "numerous doctors and medics who had been in hospitals that had been bombed whose families had been killed but in Israeli targeted assassinations on them"

###### Effect

Serious allegations against a sovereign state are presented as established background fact. The BBC's compliance concerns — which may have related precisely to the verifiability of these claims — are rendered invisible.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The "How to Survive a War Zone" controversy — the film narrated by the son of a Hamas official — is mentioned but never explained in terms of what it revealed about BBC editorial processes.

Relevant at: 01:50–01:56 — "this is the one that was narrated by a 14-year-old son of a Hamas official"

###### Effect

The audience is given a shorthand reference to a major controversy without understanding its substance, making it impossible to assess whether the BBC's subsequent caution was reasonable or excessive.

*Summary: The three most consequential omissions — the BBC's actual compliance reasoning, independent verification of the documentary's claims, and the substance of the prior controversy — are precisely the information needed to evaluate whether the BBC acted wrongly. Their absence structurally advantages the guest's narrative.*

## Missing Voices

- BBC Director-General / Editorial Standards team: Would have provided the institutional rationale for the delay, compliance concerns, and the relationship between the Johnson Report investigation and the documentary scheduling.
- Ofcom spokesperson: Would have clarified whether the BBC's conduct in delaying a cleared documentary constitutes a breach of broadcasting obligations.



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

- Israeli Embassy spokesperson: Would have responded to the documentary's allegations of targeted assassinations of medics and deliberate hospital attacks.
- Independent media law expert: Would have contextualised when editorial delay is legally and ethically defensible versus constituting suppression.
- Channel 4 commissioning editor: Would have explained what compliance process they applied when they broadcast the film, and why they were satisfied where the BBC was not.
- A doctor/medic featured in the documentary: Would have provided direct testimony about the impact of the delay on their safety and the public interest dimension.
- Media academic specialising in conflict journalism: Would have provided comparative context on how other broadcasters handle politically sensitive war-zone documentaries.
- A representative of the groups lobbying the BBC: Would have explained what specific objections were raised to the documentary's content.



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 01:21–01:24

Figure: "By the end of the year, there were hundreds of medics who'd been killed, hundreds hundreds who'd been detained and tortured"

Missing Context: No source is given for these figures. "Hundreds" is repeated for rhetorical emphasis. The figures are not attributed to any organisation (WHO, Gaza Health Ministry, IDF, independent monitors) and are not distinguished between verified and alleged cases.

### Effect

The figures create a powerful emotional impression of scale without providing verifiable data. The repetition of "hundreds hundreds" is a rhetorical device, not a statistical claim.

*Summary: Numerical manipulation is limited but present — unattributed casualty figures are used rhetorically rather than analytically. The absence of sourcing prevents independent verification and embeds contested claims as background fact.*



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

**Timestamp** 01:50–01:56

**Quote** *"this is the one that was narrated by a 14-year-old son of a Hamas official"*

Technique: The "How to Survive a War Zone" controversy is invoked by name-dropping the Hamas connection. This associates the BBC's editorial caution with the prior scandal, implying that the same institutional failure that produced the Hamas-narrator film is responsible for suppressing the Gaza doctors documentary.

**Effect** The BBC's compliance concerns — which may have been a reasonable response to the prior scandal — are reframed as evidence of the same institutional dysfunction that caused the scandal in the first place.

### Association 2:

**Timestamp** 04:25–04:30

**Quote** *"At the BBC and especially on the Middle East, especially on Gaza, there is no clarity as to who is making what decision"*

Technique: The BBC's Gaza coverage is associated with institutional opacity and dysfunction. The repetition of "especially on the Middle East, especially on Gaza" implies that the BBC's problems are specifically concentrated in its most politically sensitive area.

**Effect** Viewers are invited to conclude that the BBC's Gaza coverage is systematically compromised — a broader claim than the specific documentary dispute warrants.

Source Check for persons framed as problematic:

No individual is framed as a conspiracy theorist in this segment. The BBC as an institution is the subject of negative association.

*Summary: Guilt by association operates primarily at the institutional level — the BBC is associated with the Hamas-narrator scandal and with systemic opacity on Middle East coverage. These associations are made through juxtaposition and implication rather than direct argument, and are not challenged by the presenter.*



## 7. TIMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00–00:04 (Opening)

Content: "I mentioned one of the documentaries that has got the beeb in uh hot water over this."

Timing Effect: The BBC is placed "in hot water" in the very first sentence. This primes the entire subsequent interview as confirmation of pre-established institutional failure. The opening frame is the most cognitively influential moment of any broadcast segment.

### Finding 2:

Position: 06:35–06:42 (Closing)

Content: "So so proud they never put it out and so vital that they never actually screened it. And we have to leave it there. But again, it's a fairly damning tale of well, you tell me."

Timing Effect: The closing summary delivers the presenter's verdict — "fairly damning tale" — as the final impression. The rhetorical "you tell me" invites the audience to reach a conclusion that has already been supplied. The recency effect ensures this verdict is disproportionately retained.

*Summary: The segment is bookended by editorial verdicts — "hot water" at the opening, "fairly damning tale" at the close — that frame the entire content as confirmation of BBC institutional failure. This is a deliberate structural choice that forecloses alternative interpretations.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

*Methodological Standard (K13): Before each assessment, the trigger event is documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective when comparable triggers at other positions produced no analogous reaction.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 02:58–03:04

Trigger Event: Guest claims BBC delayed documentary because "someone was going on holiday in Yorkshire."

Reaction: "Sorry, they delayed the the the screening of a vital documentary into the situation in Gaza because somebody was going on holiday."

### Comparison

At 01:50–01:56, the presenter mentions that the prior BBC film was "narrated by a 14-year-old son of a Hamas official" — a potentially more serious editorial failure — without any comparable expression of outrage or incredulity.

Asymmetry: Confirmed. The presenter expresses theatrical disbelief at the BBC's scheduling excuse but does not express equivalent outrage at the Hamas-narrator scandal, which arguably represents a more serious editorial failure. The selective outrage targets BBC bureaucratic dysfunction while treating the Hamas-narrator issue as mere background context.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 06:35–06:42

Trigger Event: Presenter summarises the entire interview.

Reaction: "it's a fairly damning tale of well, you tell me."

### Comparison

No equivalent editorial verdict is offered about the documentary's unverified claims (targeted assassinations, torture of detainees) or about the Hamas-narrator film.

Asymmetry: Confirmed. The "damning" verdict is reserved exclusively for the BBC's editorial conduct. The documentary's own claims — which may have been the source of the BBC's compliance concerns — are never subjected to equivalent scrutiny.

*Summary: Selective outrage is directed consistently at the BBC's institutional behaviour while the documentary's unverified claims and the Hamas-narrator controversy are treated without equivalent critical scrutiny. This asymmetry reinforces the segment's one-sided framing.*



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

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

*Share of covered perspectives*

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

- [A] The BBC's own editorial justification for the delay — what specific compliance concerns were raised?
- [B] The perspective of BBC journalists and editors who supported or opposed the delay internally
- [C] The Israeli government's or Israeli embassy's position on the documentary's content
- [D] The perspective of the doctors/medics featured in the documentary — were their accounts independently verified?
- [E] The perspective of pro-Israel lobby groups who may have lobbied the BBC — what specifically did they object to?
- [F] The perspective of media regulators (Ofcom) on whether the BBC's conduct breached broadcasting standards
- [G] The perspective of Channel 4, which ultimately broadcast the film — what compliance process did they apply?
- [H] The perspective of independent media ethics experts on when editorial delay is legitimate vs. suppression
- [I] The perspective of Palestinian advocacy groups on the broader pattern of BBC Gaza coverage
- [J] The perspective of the Johnson Report itself — what did it actually find, and how does it relate to this film?



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:00–00:04
Quote	<i>"I mentioned one of the documentaries that has got the beeb in uh hot water over this."</i>
Manipulation	The BBC is pre-framed as an institution "in hot water" before any evidence is presented. The phrase "hot water" establishes institutional culpability as the baseline assumption.
Why problematic	Viewers are primed to interpret everything that follows as confirmation of BBC wrongdoing rather than as one side of a disputed editorial decision.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	05:12–05:17
Quote	<i>"understandably it's a vital piece of work and and it seems like even now Ben there was no good reason given to you for for pulling it."</i>
Manipulation	The presenter editorialises ("understandably," "vital piece of work," "no good reason") within what is framed as a neutral question. The word "pulling" implies deliberate suppression rather than scheduling delay.
Why problematic	The presenter adopts the guest's framing as objective fact, collapsing the distinction between interviewer and advocate.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	06:35–06:42
Quote	<i>"So so proud they never put it out and so vital that they never actually screened it. And we have to leave it there. But again, it's a fairly damning tale of well, you tell me."</i>
Manipulation	The closing summary is entirely editorial — "fairly damning tale" — and the rhetorical "you tell me" invites the audience to reach a predetermined conclusion. This is the final impression left with viewers.
Why problematic	Closing frames have disproportionate cognitive weight (recency effect). The presenter's verdict — "damning" — is stated as near-fact without qualification.

*Summary: The entire segment is framed as an exposé of BBC institutional failure. The framing is established in the opening sentence, reinforced throughout by presenter editorialising, and sealed with an explicit verdict in the*



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

*closing line. No alternative frame — legitimate editorial caution, compliance complexity, or disputed facts — is offered.*



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

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:47–03:48
<b>Quote</b>	"What a mess."
<b>Manipulation</b>	The presenter interjects with an evaluative verdict ("what a mess") mid-interview, adopting the guest's narrative as established fact.
<b>Why problematic</b>	Neutral alternative would be: "That's a serious allegation — what was the BBC's explanation?" The word "mess" is a loaded editorial judgment, not a journalistic observation.

<b>Finding 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:55–03:56
<b>Quote</b>	"It was almost an open lie."
<b>Manipulation</b>	The guest uses the phrase "open lie" to characterise BBC communications. The presenter does not challenge this characterisation or seek clarification.
<b>Why problematic</b>	"Lie" implies deliberate deception. The BBC's conduct could alternatively be characterised as institutional confusion, risk-aversion, or poor communication. The unchallenged use of "lie" frames the BBC as acting in bad faith.

<b>Finding 3:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	05:05–05:08
<b>Quote</b>	"in Israeli targeted assassinations on them"
<b>Manipulation</b>	The guest uses the phrase "Israeli targeted assassinations" as an established fact, not an allegation. The presenter does not query this characterisation.
<b>Why problematic</b>	"Targeted assassination" is a legally and politically charged term implying deliberate, unlawful killing. Whether Israeli military strikes on medical personnel constitute targeted assassinations is precisely the kind of contested claim that requires journalistic scrutiny. Its unchallenged use embeds a serious allegation as background fact.

*Summary: The language throughout — "mess," "open lie," "targeted assassinations," "damning tale" — consistently adopts the most adversarial framing available. Neutral or contested alternatives are never offered, and the presenter reinforces rather than interrogates loaded terminology.*



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological Standard (K5): Before each assessment, the trigger event is documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric when comparable triggers at other guests/positions produced no analogous intervention.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 02:58–03:04

Trigger Event: Guest claims the BBC delayed the documentary because "someone was going on holiday in Yorkshire."

Presenter Quote: "Sorry, they delayed the the the screening of a vital documentary into the situation in Gaza because somebody was going on holiday."

### Comparison

No comparable moment exists where the presenter expresses similar incredulity at a claim favourable to the BBC. The presenter's interjection here functions as validation and amplification of the guest's most rhetorically effective anecdote.

Asymmetry: Confirmed. The presenter's interruption is not a challenge but an echo — repeating the claim in more dramatic form ("vital documentary") to heighten its impact. No analogous amplification occurs when the guest makes claims that could be questioned (e.g., "targeted assassinations").

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 03:47–03:50

Trigger Event: Guest describes the BBC's admission that they had been delaying the film due to the Johnson Report while denying it.

Presenter Quote: "What a mess."

### Comparison

No moment in the interview where the presenter offers a similarly sympathetic editorial verdict on the BBC's position or challenges the guest's characterisation of events.

Asymmetry: Confirmed. "What a mess" is an editorial verdict delivered in solidarity with the guest's narrative. The BBC's perspective is never similarly validated or even neutrally presented.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 05:12–05:20

Trigger Event: Guest has completed his account of the delay process.

Presenter Quote: "understandably it's a vital piece of work and and it seems like even now Ben there was no good reason given to you for for pulling it."

### Comparison

No instance where the presenter characterises the BBC's position as "understandable" or offers a sympathetic framing of institutional caution.

Asymmetry: Confirmed. The presenter's question contains three embedded editorial judgments ("understandably," "vital piece of work," "no good reason") that pre-answer the question being asked.



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

*Summary: The presenter functions throughout as an advocate for the guest's position rather than as a neutral interviewer. Interventions consistently amplify, validate, and editorially endorse the guest's narrative. No comparable interventions occur in support of the BBC's position, which is never directly represented.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Ben Deair, 00:29: "Just talk us through in your own words if you wouldn't mind. Um, your involvement in the making of this documentary and your understanding of why the BBC decided not to screen it." — Very soft/open  
To BBC (absent): No questions directed to the BBC at all.

#### Comparison

The guest is invited to narrate freely ("in your own words") without any challenge. The BBC is not present to answer any questions. The asymmetry is structural — one party is questioned softly, the other is not questioned at all but is characterised through the guest's account.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To Ben Deair, 05:17–05:27: "What do you make, if I could just ask you, what do you make more broadly of the sort of mess the BBC have got themselves into over their handling of this story and this issue?" — Leading/soft  
To BBC (absent): No equivalent question about the documentary's compliance challenges or the complexity of covering Gaza.

#### Comparison

The question to Deair contains the editorial verdict ("mess") within its framing, making it impossible to answer without endorsing the premise. No equivalent loaded question is posed to any BBC representative.

*Summary: All questions are directed to a single guest and are uniformly open, sympathetic, or leading in his favour. The BBC — the subject of the allegations — is never questioned, challenged, or given an opportunity to respond. This is a structural asymmetry that cannot be remedied by soft questioning alone.*



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

05:28–05:52

Construct: "The BBC, I know, will say and do say, well, we we're caught between a rock and a hard place."

#### Analysis

The presenter briefly acknowledges the BBC's position — "caught between a rock and a hard place" — but this is immediately followed by the guest's dismissal of it ("However, every issue, every news story you cover has interest groups lobbying"). The BBC's position is introduced only to be refuted, creating the appearance of balance without its substance.

*Summary: False balance is limited in this segment — the BBC's position is not genuinely represented at all, so there is no pretence of balance to critique. The brief acknowledgment at 05:28 is the closest the segment comes to presenting the BBC's perspective, but it is filtered through the guest and immediately dismissed. Score reflects the near-total absence of balance rather than a false construction of it.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda Element Set: The BBC's suppression of the documentary is treated as an established fact rather than an allegation.

#### Timestamp

00:07–00:15 — "It's about um medics operating in Gaza and it was pulled by the BBC."

Alternative Agenda: Whether the BBC's delay constituted suppression, legitimate editorial caution, or compliance-driven scheduling is the central question — but it is pre-answered in the opening sentence.

### Finding 2:

Agenda Element Set: The documentary's claims about Israeli conduct are treated as verified background fact.

#### Timestamp

05:03–05:10 — "in Israeli targeted assassinations on them"

Alternative Agenda: The verifiability of the documentary's central claims — which may have been the BBC's actual compliance concern — is never placed on the agenda.

### Finding 3:

Agenda Element Set: The BBC's institutional dysfunction on Gaza coverage is treated as a systemic pattern rather than a specific incident.

#### Timestamp

04:25–04:30 — "At the BBC and especially on the Middle East, especially on Gaza, there is no clarity as to who is making what decision"

Alternative Agenda: Whether this specific incident reflects systemic failure or an exceptional circumstance under extraordinary editorial pressure is never examined.

*Summary: The agenda is set firmly around BBC institutional failure as established fact. The documentary's own claims, the BBC's compliance reasoning, and the broader context of Gaza coverage complexity are systematically excluded from the agenda, ensuring that the only question the segment addresses is how badly the BBC behaved — not whether it behaved badly.*



## CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

#### Dominant Techniques

---

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 8):** The BBC's own compliance reasoning, the documentary's unverified claims, the Johnson Report's actual findings, and all regulatory context are entirely absent. This structural omission makes the BBC's position appear indefensible by default, since it is never presented.
- 2. Framing (Score 7):** The segment is bookended by editorial verdicts — "hot water" at the opening, "fairly damning tale" at the close — that pre-determine the audience's interpretive framework. Every piece of information is received within a frame of established BBC culpability.
- 3. Expert/Source Selection (Score 7 / 7):** A single, directly conflicted source (the documentary's producer) is presented as a credible independent witness. No BBC voice, regulatory expert, or independent media analyst is consulted, making the segment structurally dependent on one-sided testimony.

#### Core Messages of the Broadcast

---

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The BBC deliberately suppressed a vital documentary about Gaza medics for political reasons, misled its producers for months, and has no coherent editorial process for sensitive Middle East coverage."

Technique: Framing + Omission — Evidence: 00:00, 04:25, 06:35

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Ben Dear is a credible, experienced journalist who was treated dishonestly by a dysfunctional institution."

Technique: Expert Selection + Moderation Behaviour — Evidence: 00:18, 03:47, 05:12

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "The BBC cannot be trusted to cover Gaza impartially and its institutional culture prioritises political self-protection over public interest journalism."

Technique: Agenda-Setting + Guilt by Association — Evidence: 04:25, 05:45, 06:40

#### Manipulation Level Classification

---

Justification: The segment scores 5.6/10 on manipulation criteria and 2.0/10 on completeness, placing it firmly in the "clear one-sidedness" category. The BBC — the subject of serious allegations — is given no voice, no representative, and no opportunity to respond. A single conflicted source narrates the entire segment while the presenter provides editorial validation rather than journalistic scrutiny. Under BBC Charter Art. 6, which requires due impartiality in news and current affairs, a segment making serious allegations about a major public institution without seeking that institution's response represents a clear departure from the standard. The low completeness score (2.0/10) reflects the systematic exclusion of perspectives that would complicate the segment's central narrative.

### CONCLUSION

---

This segment presents a one-sided account of a disputed editorial decision by the BBC, relying exclusively on testimony from a directly conflicted source (the documentary's producer) while providing no BBC response, no regulatory context, no independent expert analysis, and no verification of the documentary's underlying claims. The presenter functions as an advocate rather than an interviewer, amplifying the guest's narrative through editorial interjections ("what a mess," "fairly damning tale") and leading questions. Under BBC Charter Art. 6 and Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5, due impartiality requires that serious allegations against any institution — including the BBC itself — be presented with appropriate balance, including the subject's response and independent contextualisation. This segment fails that standard. It is notable that the segment appears to be broadcast on a channel other than the BBC (likely GB News, based on tone and framing), which means the BBC Charter's direct obligations do not apply to the broadcaster — but the analytical standard for due impartiality in public interest journalism remains relevant as a benchmark. The segment would not meet BBC Charter Art. 6 standards if broadcast on the BBC itself.



## CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
Conservative	0	Not mentioned in segment; no representation or misrepresentation.
Labour	0	Not mentioned in segment; no representation or misrepresentation.
Lib Dems	0	Not mentioned in segment; no representation or misrepresentation.
SNP	0	Not mentioned in segment; no representation or misrepresentation.
Reform UK	0	Not mentioned in segment; no representation or misrepresentation.
Green	0	Not mentioned in segment; no representation or misrepresentation.

Note: This segment does not engage with party-political positions. The subject matter — BBC editorial conduct on Gaza coverage — is not framed in party-political terms. No party's programme positions are represented, misrepresented, or omitted.

### Party Bias Summary

- Most Accurate Representation: N/A — no party positions engaged
- Strongest Distortion: N/A — no party positions engaged
- Average Deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: The segment has no direct party-political bias in terms of programme position representation. However, the institutional target of the segment — the BBC — has a complex relationship with the political landscape: the BBC's Charter renewal is under Labour government oversight, and criticism of the BBC's Gaza coverage comes from both left (insufficient criticism of Israel) and right (activist journalism, Hamas-narrator scandal). The segment's framing — emphasising BBC suppression of pro-Palestinian content — implicitly aligns with a left-leaning critique of BBC Gaza coverage, though this is not made explicit.



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

### Assessment under BBC Charter Art. 6

#### Violation 1:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5 (Due Impartiality)

Facts: Serious allegations are made against the BBC as an institution — deliberate suppression of a documentary, systematic mismanagement, and institutional dishonesty — without any BBC response being sought or presented.

Evidence: Timestamp 05:12–05:20 — "it seems like even now Ben there was no good reason given to you for pulling it"

Assessment: Due impartiality requires that when serious allegations are made against any institution, that institution's response must be sought and, if unavailable, the audience must be informed that it was sought and refused. Neither condition is met here. The BBC's position is paraphrased by its critic at 05:28 but never directly represented. This would constitute a breach of Section 5.1 of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code if broadcast on a regulated channel.

#### Violation 2:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5.7 (Undue Prominence)

Facts: A single, directly conflicted source (the documentary's producer) is given undue prominence as the sole substantive voice in a segment making serious allegations about a major public institution.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:18–06:42 — Ben Dearir speaks for approximately 68% of the segment's duration with no counterbalancing voice.

Assessment: Section 5.7 requires that views and facts are not misrepresented and that significant views are given due weight. The exclusive reliance on a conflicted source, without any counterbalancing expert, BBC representative, or independent analyst, gives undue prominence to one perspective in a genuinely contested dispute.

#### Violation 3:

Standard: BBC Charter Art. 6 / Accuracy standard

Facts: The documentary's claims — "Israeli targeted assassinations" of medics, torture of detainees — are presented as established background fact without attribution, sourcing, or independent verification.

Evidence: Timestamp 05:03–05:10 — "in Israeli targeted assassinations on them"

Assessment: Accuracy standards require that factual claims, particularly those involving serious allegations against a sovereign state, be attributed, sourced, and distinguished from allegations. The unchallenged presentation of "targeted assassinations" as fact — rather than as the documentary's claim — fails this standard.

### Overall Assessment BBC Charter Art. 6

This segment, assessed against BBC Charter Art. 6 and Ofcom Broadcasting Code Section 5, exhibits three distinct areas of concern: failure to seek or present the subject institution's response to serious allegations; undue prominence given to a single conflicted source; and presentation of unverified, serious factual claims as established background fact. The segment's completeness score of 2.0/10 reflects the systematic exclusion of perspectives necessary for due impartiality. While the segment appears to be broadcast on a channel other than the BBC (and therefore not directly subject to BBC Charter obligations), it would fail BBC Charter Art. 6 standards if broadcast on BBC platforms. As a matter of journalistic ethics applicable to any public interest broadcaster, the segment falls significantly short of the due impartiality standard.

### SOURCE DEPTH CHECK (Mandatory for all cited expert bodies / NGOs / advisory bodies)

Organisation 1: Basement Films / Ben Dearir

**1. FUNDING:** Commercial independent production company; revenue from broadcaster commissions. Direct financial interest in the outcome of this dispute.

**2. MANDATE:** Production of documentary content for broadcast; not a neutral analytical or regulatory body.



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

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in the BBC being seen as having wrongly suppressed the film; reputational and financial benefit from the BBC's conduct being discredited.

**4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 (direct financial stake)

D2 Personal Risk: +1 (some professional risk in criticising BBC publicly)

D3 Subject Competence: +1 (genuine broadcast journalism experience)

D4 Opinion Consistency: 0 (no prior statements available)

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 (anecdotal narrative, no documentary evidence presented)

D6 Source Level: -1 (secondary; unverified account of internal BBC communications)

**TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** A BBC editorial compliance expert, the Johnson Report itself, or an independent media ethics specialist would provide the necessary counterbalance. None is consulted.

Organisation 2: The Johnson Report (referenced)

**1. FUNDING:** Internal BBC investigation; funded by the BBC.

**2. MANDATE:** Internal review of BBC editorial conduct — not a public regulatory document.

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** As an internal BBC document, it may reflect institutional self-interest; however, its actual findings are never disclosed in the segment, making assessment impossible.

**4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Cannot be assessed — the report's content is never disclosed.

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** The report itself, or an independent summary of its findings, would allow viewers to assess the BBC's stated rationale for the delay.

*IMPORTANT NOTE: "Former editor of Channel 4 News" is a professional credential, not a guarantee of neutrality on a matter in which the individual has a direct financial and reputational stake. The credential is a social attribution that must itself be scrutinised in context.*

*Analysis completed under Methodological Standard Version 2.7-detail. All trigger events documented per K5+K13. All source assessments conducted per 6-Dimension Credibility Matrix. Language: English throughout.*



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**6.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**6.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**6.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

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

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch) | *Methods Report March 2026* | *Converter 3.3 (2026-05-14)*



**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](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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.**