



NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-03_radio_news_0200

Broadcast: 2026-05-03 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 16:12

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: 放送法 第4条

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	JCP	CDP	DPP	Komeito	LDP	JIP
CHES	1.50	3.50	4.80	5.20	7.00	7.80
Spectrum	Left	Left	Center	Center	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)	5.0 / 10	Balanced
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------------



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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The current Japanese government is a coalition government formed by the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and Komeito. In the House of Representatives election on October 27, 2024, the LDP won 191 seats (a significant reduction) and Komeito won 24 seats, resulting in a situation where the coalition falls short of a majority. The major opposition parties are the Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP, 148 seats), Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin, 38 seats), the Democratic Party for the People (DPP, 28 seats), the Japanese Communist Party (JCP, 8 seats), and Reiwa Shinsengumi (Reiwa, 9 seats).

Party	Left-Right Score (0–10)	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key Policies
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Uphold Article 9, immediate nuclear abolition, anti-military expansion
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2.5	1	Opposition	Pacifism, constitutional preservation, nuclear phase-out
Reiwa Shinsengumi (Reiwa)	2.5	9	Opposition	Abolish consumption tax, anti-military expansion, anti-establishment
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Constitutional preservation, distribution-focused, nuclear phase-out
Komeito	5.0	24	Coalition Government	Pacifism, social security, LDP restraint
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Middle	Consumption tax reduction, pragmatism
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Constitutional revision, defence strengthening, nuclear restart
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition	Deregulation, administrative reform, constitutional revision
Sanseito	9.0	3	Opposition	Ultra-nationalism, right-wing populism

The current major political fault lines in Japan are: the conflict between constitutional preservationists and revisionists over constitutional revision (particularly Article 9); the conflict between those calling for immediate abolition and those promoting restart over nuclear energy policy; the conflict between proponents of active defence and pacifists over the defence budget increase (2% of GDP target); and conflicts over social values such as separate surnames for married couples and LGBTQ rights. Following the LDP's loss of a majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election, political fluidity has increased.

NHK is a public broadcaster based on the Broadcasting Act, and Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act obliges it to maintain political fairness, accuracy in reporting, and the presentation of multifaceted viewpoints. Because the 12 members of NHK's Board of Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (with Diet approval), structural proximity to the government has been criticised since the Abe administration (2012–2020). Japan ranks 70th in the RSF Press



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

Freedom Index (2024), and the press club (kisha club) system is a structural factor that produces unequal access to information.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

This broadcast covers international news (Iran–US relations) and domestic incidents (drowning and fire), and contains no content directly related to Japanese party politics. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the accuracy of the depiction of each party's policy positions.

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Depiction in Broadcast vs. Party's Policy Position
LDP	0	Not mentioned — no depiction of policy position — not subject to evaluation
CDP	0	Not mentioned — no depiction of policy position — not subject to evaluation
Komeito	0	Not mentioned — no depiction of policy position — not subject to evaluation
Ishin	0	Not mentioned — no depiction of policy position — not subject to evaluation
JCP	0	Not mentioned — no depiction of policy position — not subject to evaluation
DPP	0	Not mentioned — no depiction of policy position — not subject to evaluation

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurately depicted: Not applicable (no parties are mentioned)
- Most strongly distorted: Not applicable
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: Because this broadcast contains no content directly related to Japanese party politics, it is impossible to assess party-political bias. However, the complete absence of any mention of the Japanese government (LDP coalition government)'s official position in reporting on the Middle East situation may indirectly have the effect of avoiding accountability for the government's foreign policy.

Overall Tendency on the Left-Right Spectrum

TENDENCY SCORE: -0.3

(Positive value = left-leaning, negative value = right-leaning, 0.0 = balanced)

Classification: Balanced

Rationale: This broadcast contains no content directly related to Japanese party politics, and elements indicating a clear tendency on the left-right spectrum are limited. The structure of placing Fars News's (pro-Iranian regime) claims at the opening and presenting doubts about the US government's cost reporting may have a slightly anti-American or anti-government nuance, but this does not directly correspond to Japan's left-right spectrum. A score of -0.3 is effectively within the range of balance and cannot be assessed as a significant tendency.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: NHK News (2:00 p.m.)
- Date (estimated from filename): Cannot be determined (no explicit indication in transcript; estimated around 2025 based on content, which includes reporting on Iran–US relations)
- Estimated broadcast duration: Approximately 5 minutes (00:00:00–00:05:20)
- Presenter/Reporter: "Habara" (announcer name, 00:04:39 "Habara has reported")
- Interviewees: None (breaking news format, no interviews)

Actors	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Habara (Announcer)	NHK News Anchor	NHK (public broadcaster)	Neutral (by institutional design)
Fars News (cited)	Pro-Iranian regime media	Iranian government-affiliated	Pro-Iranian government
CNN (cited)	US commercial broadcaster	US commercial media	Western mainstream media
President Trump (mentioned)	US President	Republican Party	Right-wing populist

Main Themes

This broadcast conveys, in breaking news format, three independent news items: the continuation and possible re-escalation of military tensions between Iran and the United States; a drowning accident during clam digging in Tokai Village, Ibaraki Prefecture; and a house fire in Imabari City, Ehime Prefecture.

Ideological Context

Regarding Iran–US relations, military tensions between the two countries have intermittently escalated since the collapse of the JCPOA nuclear agreement, and at the time of this broadcast the focus is on Iranian attacks on US military facilities in the Middle East and the scale of the damage. Fars News is known as a pro-regime media outlet close to Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and its reporting may carry political intent. CNN's reporting is said to be based on satellite image analysis and interviews with sources, but a US media perspective is inherent. The drowning accident and the fire are reported in the context of seasonal safety awareness.

Perspectives Required for Balanced Broadcasting (Independent Assessment Based on World Knowledge)

The following perspectives are considered necessary for balanced reporting:

- [A] Direct quotation of Iran's official position (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and government statements)
- [B] Official views of the US government and Department of Defense
- [C] Analysis by independent military experts and security researchers
- [D] Perspective of neutral Middle Eastern media (Al Jazeera, etc.)
- [E] Independent verification of damage to US military facilities (sources other than Fars News and CNN)
- [F] Impact on Japan's security and foreign policy (the Japanese government's position)
- [G] Assessment from the framework of international law and the UN Security Council



[H] Detailed safety information on weather and sea conditions in the drowning accident

[I] Details of fire-fighting and emergency response in the fire, and lessons learned

[J] Voices of civil society and dissidents within Iran

Confirmation of Treatment of Each Perspective

[A] Iran's official position — Partially addressed

Timestamp: 00:00:04–00:00:43

Quotation: "There is a possibility of renewed conflict between Iran and the United States. It is clear that America does not honour any agreements or promises."

Assessment: Conveyed via Fars News and transmitted as "a statement by a senior official of the central command," not as a direct Iranian government statement. Insufficient disclosure that this is information filtered through a pro-regime media outlet.

[B] Official views of the US government and Department of Defense — Partially addressed

Timestamp: 00:01:44–00:01:55

Quotation: "Regarding the cost of operations in Iran that the US Department of Defense had announced"

Assessment: The Department of Defense's official figure (approximately \$25 billion) is mentioned, but the US government's official position and rebuttals are not presented in an independent manner.

[C] Analysis by independent military experts and security researchers — Completely absent

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: No expert commentary whatsoever; interpretation and contextualisation of information is insufficient.

[D] Perspective of neutral Middle Eastern media — Completely absent

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: Only the two poles of Fars News (pro-Iran) and CNN (US) are used; the perspective of a neutral third-party media outlet is completely absent.

[E] Independent verification of damage to US military facilities — Absent

Timestamp: 00:01:00–00:01:36

Quotation: "Based on satellite image analysis and information from American and Gulf state sources"

Assessment: CNN's sources are limited to "American and Gulf state sources," and there is no confirmation by an independent verification body.

[F] Impact on Japan's security and foreign policy — Completely absent

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: As Japan's public broadcaster, there is no mention whatsoever of the impact of the Middle East situation on Japan's diplomacy and energy security.

[G] International law and the UN Security Council framework — Completely absent

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: No assessment of military action under international law is made at all.

[H] Safety information on the drowning accident — Partially addressed

Timestamp: 00:03:20–00:03:26

Quotation: "A wave advisory had been in effect until 10 a.m. yesterday along the northern coast of Ibaraki Prefecture."

Assessment: The wave advisory is mentioned, but specific safety measures and cautionary information are insufficient.

[I] Details of fire-fighting and emergency response in the fire — Partially addressed

Timestamp: 00:04:01–00:04:07

Quotation: "The fire was extinguished approximately one and a half hours later"



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

Assessment: Basic facts are conveyed, but instructive safety information is absent.

[J] Voices of civil society and dissidents within Iran — Completely absent

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: The diverse voices within Iranian society are not reflected at all.

Absent Voices

- Independent Middle East security experts (based in Japan): Could have analysed the risks that an Iran–US military clash poses to Japan's energy security and passage through the Strait of Hormuz
- Official spokespeople for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defence: Could have presented the Japanese government's official position and diplomatic response
- UN Security Council and international law experts: Could have provided an assessment of the legality of military action under international law
- Journalists from Al Jazeera and other Middle Eastern media: Could have supplemented information from a regional perspective
- Iran researchers and regional specialists: Could have explained the political context of Fars News reporting
- Safety officials from the Japan Coast Guard and Japan Meteorological Agency: Could have provided specific safety information regarding the drowning accident
- Fire and Disaster Management Agency and fire investigation specialists: Could have provided cause analysis and prevention information for the house fire
- Official spokesperson for the US Department of Defense: Could have directly presented the official position on costs and damage



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. Expert Selection

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Fars News (Pro-Iranian regime media)

Timestamp 00:00:04–00:00:43

Statement "There is a possibility of renewed conflict between Iran and the United States. It is clear that America does not honour any agreements or promises."

Positioning: A pro-regime media outlet close to Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. Has a strong tendency to reflect the Iranian government's official position.

Absent opposing views: Official statements from the US Department of Defense, analysis by independent security experts

Source Depth Check:

(a) Funding: Said to be operated with funds from the Iranian government and Revolutionary Guard Corps system. Conflict of interest: A structural reporting bias in the direction of justifying Iranian government policy exists.

(b) Mandate: Difficult to reconcile with neutral assessment, as it is established and operated as a media outlet that advocates the Iranian government's position.

(c) Reliability Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, each -2 to +2):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Structural bias supporting government position as Iranian government-affiliated media

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Pro-regime reporting carries no personal risk

D3 Professional competence: +1 — High access to information within Iran

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Consistent in following government policy, but not independent consistency

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Contains emotional expressions such as "reckless and foolish"

D6 Source level: +1 — Close to primary source, but with political filter

TOTAL: -2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: This source is noted as "pro-regime," but in the subsequent presentation of content it is treated on equal footing with neutral sources, and the explanation of its structural bias is insufficient.

Expert 2: CNN (US commercial broadcaster)

Timestamp 00:00:58–00:01:55

Statement "Based on satellite image analysis and information from American and Gulf state sources, at least 16 US military facilities in 8 countries in the Middle East were damaged by attacks by Iran and its allied forces"

Positioning: A major US commercial broadcaster. Has a perspective as a mainstream Western media outlet.

Absent opposing views: Independent assessment by independent satellite image analysis organisations (e.g., Planet Labs, Maxar, etc.)



Source Depth Check:

(a) Funding: Commercial company (subsidiary of Warner Bros. Discovery). Advertising revenue and subscriptions. Conflict of interest: Possible reporting bias in the direction of increasing ratings and attention.

(b) Mandate: Claims neutrality as an independent news organisation, but a US media perspective is inherent.

(c) Reliability Matrix:

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Tendency to be close to the US perspective as a US media outlet

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Institutional risk is moderate

D3 Professional competence: +2 — High expertise in international reporting

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistency of reporting standards is relatively high

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Reporting based on data such as satellite imagery

D6 Source level: +1 — Direct interviews with sources (though anonymous)

TOTAL: +4 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: CNN is noted as reporting "citing sources," but the anonymity of its sources and the bias towards US and Gulf state sources makes independent verification difficult.

Absent Expert Groups:

- Middle East security experts based in Japan (university/think tank affiliation)
- UN and international law experts
- Independent satellite image analysis organisations

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Fars News (Pro-Iranian regime media)	-2	-1	+1	0	-1	+1	-2	Yellow
CNN (US commercial broadcaster)	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	+4	Yellow

Summary (Matrix Results):

- Fars News: Source Traffic Light Yellow (total -2), structurally biased as a pro-regime media outlet
- CNN: Source Traffic Light Yellow (total +4), high expertise but inherent US perspective and problematic anonymous sources
- Both sources are not independent neutral experts but rather media outlets aligned with opposing parties, and a genuinely multifaceted perspective is absent.



2. Source Selection

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Fars News Agency

Timestamp

00:00:04–00:00:43 — Statement: "There is a possibility of renewed conflict between Iran and the United States."

(a) Funding and operating body: A semi-official media organisation close to Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC). Reporting that supports Iranian government policy is structurally expected.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: A structure in which the organisation's survival and funding are maintained by producing reporting that justifies the Iranian government's position.

(c) Absent opposing sources: Official statements from the US Department of Defense, analysis by independent Middle East security experts, reporting by neutral media such as Al Jazeera

As a state-funded organisation: As Iranian government-affiliated media, the structural bias in the direction of justifying Iranian government actions should have been made explicit. The note "pro-regime" exists but is insufficient.

Absent opposing sources: Assessment by independent international security organisations (IISS, SIPRI, etc.)

Source 2: CNN (Cable News Network)

Timestamp

00:00:58–00:01:55 — Statement: "Based on satellite image analysis and information from American and Gulf state sources"

(a) Funding and operating body: A commercial broadcaster under Warner Bros. Discovery. Operated through advertising revenue, subscriptions, and paid channel contracts.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: As a US media outlet, there is a tendency to be close to the US perspective, and a structural bias towards "American and Gulf state sources" exists.

(c) Absent opposing sources: Official positions of Russia, China, and Iran; independent satellite image analysis organisations

As a commercial media outlet: Although it is an independent news organisation, its sources are limited to "America and Gulf states," and there is a possibility of geopolitical bias.

Absent opposing sources: Independent assessment of costs and damage by an independent international investigative body

Summary: The source selection in this broadcast is limited to two opposing non-neutral sources — the pro-Iranian regime Fars News and the US media CNN — and independent third-party sources are completely absent. This bipolar structure stages a surface appearance of "presenting both sides" while in reality excluding independent expert analysis.



3. Time Allocation

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Iran–US relations news (citing Fars News and CNN): approximately 1 minute 55 seconds (approximately 37%)
- Ibaraki Prefecture drowning accident: approximately 1 minute (approximately 19%)
- Imabari City, Ehime Prefecture fire: approximately 1 minute (approximately 19%)
- Repetition/overlapping sections (technical duplication in transcript): approximately 45 seconds (approximately 14%)
- Opening, closing, and pauses: approximately 40 seconds (approximately 11%)

Time allocation by position in Iran–US relations:

- Fars News (pro-Iranian regime) quotation: approximately 40 seconds (approximately 35% of Iran-related content)
- CNN (US media) quotation: approximately 55 seconds (approximately 48% of Iran-related content)
- Neutral analysis/impact on Japan: 0 seconds (0%)

Summary: In reporting on Iran–US relations, time is concentrated on two non-neutral sources — Fars News and CNN — and there is zero time for independent analysis or the impact on Japan. However, given the constraints of the breaking news format, this time allocation is also a formal issue.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context Impact on Japan's security and energy policy

Relevant timestamp: 00:00:04–00:01:55 (Iran–US relations overall)

Impact

The impact of tensions in the Middle East on Japan's Strait of Hormuz-dependent energy supply, the dispatch of the Self-Defense Forces to the Middle East, and the context of the Japan–US alliance is completely absent. As NHK is Japan's public broadcaster, mention of the impact on Japan can be considered a basic reporting obligation.

Omission 2:

Context Official US government rebuttal and explanation regarding damage to US military facilities

Relevant timestamp: 00:01:00–00:01:55

Impact

Because no official US government position is presented regarding the scale of damage reported by CNN (16 facilities, costs of \$40–50 billion), there is a risk that viewers will accept CNN's estimates as fact.

Omission 3:

Context Detailed explanation of the political character of Fars News

Relevant timestamp: 00:00:04–00:00:10

Impact

With only a single-word note of "pro-regime media outlet," there is no explanation that Fars News is affiliated with the Revolutionary Guard Corps and that its reporting has the character of political propaganda. Viewers cannot appropriately evaluate the credibility of this source.

Summary: The greatest omissions in this broadcast are the perspective of "impact on Japan," which should naturally be included as Japan's public broadcaster, and the absence of balanced rebuttals to opposing sources. Despite the constraints of the breaking news format, these omissions are problematic from the perspective of the multifaceted presentation of viewpoints required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.



5. Manipulation of Numbers

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:01:38–00:01:55

Numbers: "The cost of operations in Iran, which the US Department of Defense had announced as approximately \$25 billion, is estimated to actually be close to \$40 billion to \$50 billion."

Absent context: The basis for the Department of Defense's figure of \$25 billion, the methodology and confidence interval of CNN's estimate of \$40–50 billion, and the comparability of the two figures (differences in items counted, etc.) are not presented.

Impact

The expression "actually" may give the impression that the Department of Defense's figure is false. Whether the discrepancy in costs is due to differences in accounting methods or intentional under-reporting remains unclear, yet the impression of the latter is emphasised.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 00:01:08–00:01:22

Numbers: "At least 16 US military facilities in 8 countries in the Middle East were damaged, and some have effectively become unusable. This is said to account for more than half of all US military bases in the Middle East."

Absent context: The total number of US military bases in the Middle East, the definition of "damaged" (ranging from minor damage to complete destruction), and the specific number of facilities that have "effectively become unusable" are unclear.

Impact

The expression "more than half" may give the impression of a devastating blow to the US military presence in the Middle East, but the context necessary to assess the actual scale of the damage is absent.

Summary: Manipulation of numbers cannot be concluded to be intentional, but the expression "actually" in the cost comparison and the presentation of the scale of damage without context carry a risk of giving viewers a false impression.



6. CONTACT GUILT

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

00:00:45–00:00:53

Quotation: "President Trump had pointed to an internal divide between hardliners and moderates within Iran's leadership in a social media post."

Technique: Introducing President Trump's remarks as a "social media post" positions them as unofficial and personal rather than through official diplomatic channels, potentially relatively reducing their policy weight.

Impact

The expression "social media post" may have the effect of implicitly reducing the credibility and official nature of the statement. However, if this was in fact the actual medium through which President Trump made the statement, it is a factual description and cannot be called manipulation.

Summary: No clear technique of guilt by association is confirmed in this broadcast. The expression "social media post" for Trump's remarks can be assessed as within the range of factual description. The score of 1 is set as a minimal cautionary note.



7. Timing

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:04–00:00:43 (opening)

Content: "There is a possibility of renewed conflict between Iran and the United States. It is clear that America does not honour any agreements or promises."

Timing effect: By placing Fars News's Iranian side claims at the opening of the broadcast, viewers' cognitive framework is first formed from the Iranian perspective. Psychologically, information presented first influences the interpretation of subsequent information (primacy effect).

Finding 2:

Position: 00:01:38–00:01:55 (end/closing of Iran-related news)

Content: "The actual cost is estimated to be close to \$40 billion to \$50 billion."

Timing effect: By presenting doubts about the US government's cost reporting as the closing of the Iran-related news, "US government opacity" is imprinted as the final impression remaining in viewers' memories (recency effect).

Summary: The timing issues are minor and cannot be concluded to be intentional manipulation. However, the placement of the Iranian side's claims at the opening and the cost doubts at the closing may contribute to the formation of specific impressions, whether intentionally or not.



8. Selective Outrage

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before evaluation, document the specific event that triggered the reaction. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if an equivalent event involving another position did not produce a similar reaction.

This broadcast is in a format of one-directional news reading by an announcer, and there are structurally no scenes showing emotional reactions or outrage. Therefore, no events that would be subject to evaluation for selective outrage are confirmed.

Triggering event: Not applicable

Reaction: Not applicable

Comparison: Because multiple positions and guests subject to evaluation do not exist, confirmation of asymmetry is impossible.

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed

Summary: Selective outrage is not confirmed given the format of this broadcast. A score of 1 does not indicate complete neutrality but rather the absence of an evaluable subject.



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).



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. Framing

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:00:04–00:00:20

Quotation: "Iran's pro-regime media outlet Fars News reported, citing a statement by a senior official of the central command, that there is a possibility of renewed conflict between Iran and the United States, and that it is clear America does not honour any agreements or promises."

Technique: Although there is a note that it is a "pro-regime media outlet," the subsequent content largely transmits Fars News's claims as-is, creating a risk that Iran's one-sided assertion that "America does not keep its promises" will circulate as fact.

Why it is problematic: Viewers may not fully understand the political character of Fars News, and a single note of "pro-regime" is insufficient to properly convey the bias of the information. Because no US rebuttal is presented with equal weight, Iran's claims are relatively emphasised.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 00:01:38–00:01:55

Quotation: "CNN reported, citing sources, that the actual cost of operations in Iran — which the US Department of Defense had announced as approximately \$25 billion — is estimated to be close to \$40 billion to \$50 billion."

Technique: Juxtaposing the Department of Defense's official announcement (\$25 billion) with CNN's estimate (\$40–50 billion) creates a frame that gives the impression the US government under-reported the costs.

Why it is problematic: With no rebuttal or explanation from the Department of Defense's official position, the use of the expression "actually" gives the impression that CNN's estimate is fact.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 00:00:45–00:00:53

Quotation: "President Trump had pointed to an internal divide between hardliners and moderates within Iran's leadership in a social media post."

Technique: Introducing President Trump's remarks as a "social media post" positions them as unofficial and personal rather than through official diplomatic channels, relativising them.

Why it is problematic: The distinction between the US President's official position and informal statements is ambiguous, and the policy weight of Trump's remarks risks being downplayed.

Summary: The framing of this broadcast does not sufficiently correct for the bias of its sources in reporting on Iran–US relations, and by juxtaposing two non-neutral sources — Fars News and CNN — it provides a specific interpretive framework while giving a neutral impression. However, given the constraints of the breaking news format, it cannot be concluded that this constitutes intentional manipulation.



11. Word Choice and Terminology

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:00:25–00:00:29

Quotation: "In response to America's reckless and foolish actions, the military is showing it is fully prepared."

Technique: The expression "reckless and foolish actions" (Fars News's wording) is quoted as-is, with insufficient editorial distancing from this strongly value-laden expression.

Why it is problematic: The expression "reckless and foolish" contains a clear value judgement. While distancing expressions such as quotation marks or "claiming that" are used, this expression has the potential to influence viewers' perceptions within the flow of the broadcast. A neutral alternative expression would be "criticising America's actions" or similar.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

00:01:26–00:01:36

Quotation: "Iran's main targets were advanced radar systems, communications systems, and aircraft, many of which were elevated and difficult to replace."

Technique: The expression "elevated and difficult to replace" carries the connotation of emphasising the strategic effectiveness of Iran's attack.

Why it is problematic: This expression is based on CNN's sources, but it contains a nuance that positively evaluates the effectiveness of Iran's military operations; as neutral reporting, it should have been limited to factual descriptions such as "suffered damage."

Summary: Problems in word choice arise primarily when Fars News's expressions are quoted directly, and can be assessed as editorial carelessness in the breaking news format rather than intentional manipulation. The overall language use is relatively neutral, and the score is low.



12. Presenter Behaviour

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before evaluation, document the specific event that triggered the intervention. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if an equivalent event involving another guest did not produce a similar intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:04:38–00:04:39

Triggering event: Closing remarks at the end of the broadcast

Quotation (presenter): "This has been the news for this hour, reported by Habara."

Comparison

Because this broadcast is not in interview format but rather a one-directional news reading by an announcer, there are no guests for whom to evaluate presenter intervention or asymmetry.

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed — Not applicable to this criterion, as it is not in interview format.

Summary: Because this broadcast is in breaking news format and contains no interviews or discussions, it is structurally impossible to assess asymmetry in presenter behaviour. The low score is due to formal constraints and is not evidence of active neutrality.



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

13. Question Asymmetry

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Because this broadcast is in breaking news format containing no interviews, there is no subject for evaluating question asymmetry. Only one-directional information transmission by the announcer takes place, and this criterion is not applicable.

Summary: Question asymmetry cannot be evaluated given the format of this broadcast. A score of 0 does not indicate neutrality but rather the absence of an evaluable subject.



14. False Balance

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:00:04–00:01:55

Structure: Juxtaposing "claims from Fars News (pro-Iranian regime)" and "reporting from CNN (US media)" stages a superficial "presentation of both sides."

Analysis

This bipolar structure stages "balance" by juxtaposing two sources aligned with opposing parties, but independent third-party analysis is completely absent in reality. Fars News advocates the Iranian government's position, and CNN relies on US and Gulf state sources; there is no truly neutral perspective between the two. This structure gives viewers the impression that "both positions were conveyed" while in reality excluding independent verification.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

00:01:38–00:01:55

Structure: Juxtaposition of "Department of Defense official announcement (\$25 billion)" and "CNN's estimate (\$40–50 billion)"

Analysis

Juxtaposing the Department of Defense's official announcement and CNN's estimate gives the impression that both have equivalent credibility, but in reality an official announcement and an estimate based on anonymous sources have methodologically different characters. This juxtaposition, combined with the expression "actually," has the effect of planting doubt about the official announcement.

Summary: The false balance in this broadcast manifests in the form of juxtaposing two sources aligned with opposing parties, and has the effect of concealing the absence of independent expert analysis. This is problematic from the perspective of the multifaceted presentation of viewpoints required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.



15. Agenda Setting

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: By presenting Iran–US military confrontation within the framework of "the possibility of renewed conflict," the continuation and escalation of military tensions is set as a predetermined course.

Timestamp

00:00:04–00:00:14 — Basis: "There is a possibility of renewed conflict between Iran and the United States."

Alternative agenda: The possibility of a diplomatic resolution, developments in nuclear agreement renegotiation, international community mediation efforts

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: By presenting damage to US military facilities with the expression "elevated and difficult to replace," the strategic effectiveness of Iran's attack is set as an established fact.

Timestamp

00:01:26–00:01:36 — Basis: "Many were elevated and difficult to replace."

Alternative agenda: US military response and recovery capabilities, actual military impact of the damage

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: As Japan's public broadcaster, the fact that the impact of the Middle East situation on Japan (energy security, foreign policy, the Japan–US alliance) does not make it onto the agenda creates an implicit premise that these issues are "unrelated to Japan."

Timestamp

Not applicable (due to absence)

Alternative agenda: Security of the Strait of Hormuz, impact on Japan's energy imports, the Japanese government's diplomatic position

Summary: The greatest problem in the agenda setting of this broadcast is that the perspective of "impact on Japan," which should naturally be included as Japan's public broadcaster, is completely excluded from the agenda. This is considered to be the result of structural constraints in the breaking news format rather than intentional exclusion, but it is problematic from the perspective of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	Expert Selection	0/10	Unremarkable
2	Source Selection	0/10	Unremarkable
3	Time Allocation	0/10	Unremarkable
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	0/10	Unremarkable
5	Manipulation of Numbers	0/10	Unremarkable
6	CONTACT GUILT	0/10	Unremarkable
7	Timing	0/10	Unremarkable
8	Selective Outrage	0/10	Unremarkable
9	COMPLETENESS	8/10	Pronounced imbalance
10	Framing	0/10	Unremarkable
11	Word Choice and Terminology	0/10	Unremarkable
12	Presenter Behaviour	0/10	Unremarkable
13	Question Asymmetry	0/10	Unremarkable
14	False Balance	0/10	Unremarkable
15	Agenda Setting	0/10	Unremarkable

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

8.0/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

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



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL ASSESSMENT (BROADCASTING ACT ARTICLE 4)

Assessment Based on Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act

Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act obliges broadcasters to maintain political fairness (Paragraph 2), accuracy in reporting (Paragraph 3), and multifaceted presentation of viewpoints (Paragraph 4).

Violation 1:

Standard: Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act (multifaceted presentation of viewpoints)

Facts: In reporting on Iran–US relations, independent expert analysis, the impact on Japan, and legal assessment under international law are completely absent, with reliance only on two non-neutral sources — Fars News and CNN.

Basis: Timestamps 00:00:04–00:01:55 — Quotation: "Iran's pro-regime media outlet Fars News..." "Meanwhile, American network CNN..."

Assessment: The requirement to "clarify viewpoints from as many angles as possible" as required by Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act is not met. However, given the constraint of the approximately 5-minute breaking news format, it cannot be concluded that this constitutes a serious violation.

Violation 2:

Standard: Article 4, Paragraph 3 of the Broadcasting Act (accuracy in reporting)

Facts: In the statement "the actual cost is estimated to be close to \$40 billion to \$50 billion," CNN's estimate based on anonymous sources is presented as if it has the same level of certainty as the Department of Defense's official announcement.

Basis: Timestamps 00:01:38–00:01:55 — Quotation: "The actual cost is estimated to be close to \$40 billion to \$50 billion."

Assessment: The expression "actually" carries the risk of presenting an estimate as fact, and is also problematic from the perspective of Article 3-2, Paragraph 1, Item 3 (clear distinction between fact and opinion). However, because the hedging expression "estimated to be...as reported" is used, it cannot be concluded that this constitutes a serious violation.

Overall Assessment Under Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act

This broadcast performs basic factual reporting within the structural constraints of the breaking news format (approximately 5 minutes), and it cannot be concluded that it constitutes a serious violation of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act. However, from the perspective of the multifaceted presentation of viewpoints required by Paragraph 4, the complete absence of independent expert analysis and the omission of the impact on Japan can be identified as problems. The fact that source selection is limited to the two poles of Fars News and CNN is a structural problem that stages a surface appearance of "presenting both sides" while in reality excluding independent verification, and improvements in source diversity as a public broadcaster are required. The expression "actually" in the cost comparison warrants caution from the perspective of Paragraph 3 (accuracy in reporting), but does not rise to a serious violation due to the hedging expression "estimated to be...as reported." Overall, this broadcast does not fully conform to the spirit of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, but no serious violation that would become legally problematic is confirmed.



CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

Fars News Agency

1. Funding: A semi-official media organisation close to Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC). Said to be operated with funds from the Iranian government and Revolutionary Guard Corps system. Conflict of interest: A structural reporting bias in the direction of justifying Iranian government policy exists.

2. Mandate: Established and operated as a media outlet that advocates the Iranian government's position; difficult to reconcile with neutral assessment.

3. Conflict of interest: A structure in which the organisation's survival and funding are guaranteed by maintaining pro-regime reporting. Reporting critical of the Iranian government threatens the organisation's survival.

4. Reliability Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, each -2 to +2):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 (structural bias supporting government position as Iranian government-affiliated media)

D2 Personal risk: -1 (pro-regime reporting carries no personal risk)

D3 Professional competence: +1 (high access to information within Iran)

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 (consistent in following government policy, but not independent consistency)

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 (contains emotional expressions such as "reckless and foolish")

D6 Source level: +1 (close to primary source, but with political filter)

TOTAL: -2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)

5. Opposing views: Official statements from the US Department of Defense, analysis by independent Middle East security experts, and reporting by neutral media such as Al Jazeera were necessary as opposing sources but were not cited.

Important: The description of Fars News as a "pro-regime" outlet is a description of its social positioning and does not in itself constitute the basis for evaluating the credibility of the information. Assessment based on the 6-dimension matrix above is necessary.

CNN (Cable News Network)

1. Funding: A commercial broadcaster under Warner Bros. Discovery. Operated through advertising revenue, subscriptions, and paid channel contracts. Conflict of interest: Possible reporting bias in the direction of increasing ratings and attention, and an inherent geopolitical perspective as a US media outlet.

2. Mandate: Claims neutrality as an independent news organisation, but a structural bias towards "American and Gulf state sources" exists.

3. Conflict of interest: As a US media outlet, there is a tendency to have a perspective close to US security interests, and reliance on anonymous sources makes independent verification difficult.

4. Reliability Matrix:

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (tendency to be close to the US perspective as a US media outlet)

D2 Personal risk: 0 (institutional risk is moderate)

D3 Professional competence: +2 (high expertise and track record in international reporting)

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 (consistency of reporting standards is relatively high)

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 (reporting based on data such as satellite imagery)

D6 Source level: +1 (direct interviews with sources, though anonymous)

TOTAL: +4 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)

5. Opposing views: Independent assessments by independent satellite image analysis organisations (Planet Labs, Maxar, etc.), official positions of Russia, China, and Iran, and analysis by international security research institutions (IISS, SIPRI, etc.) were necessary as opposing sources but were not cited.

Important: The fact that CNN is widely recognised as a "credible news organisation" is a description of its social positioning and does not in itself constitute the basis for evaluating the credibility of the information. Assessment based on the 6-dimension matrix above is necessary.

This analysis was prepared based on version 2.7-detail, applying methodological principles K5+K13 (recording of events that triggered interventions). As limitations of the analysis, it is noted that this transcript is an audio-only



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

record and evaluation of visual elements is impossible, and that because the broadcast date and time cannot be determined, there are constraints on the complete assessment of contemporaneous context.

Legal and Methodological Notes

No factual determination

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

No legal judgment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under 放送法 第4条. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular 総務省).

No proof of causation

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

No judgment of intent

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

Heuristic comparison tool

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

Legal Basis Japan — NHK

Legislation

- Broadcasting Act (放送法, Act No. 132 of 1950, last amended 2024)
- NHK Reception Agreement (NHK受信規約)
- Radio Act (電波法)

Broadcasting Act Article 4 (Editing Standards)

Original text (Japanese):

放送事業者は、国内放送及び内外放送の放送番組の編集に当たっては、次の各号の定めるところによらなければならない。

- 一 公安及び善良な風俗を害しないこと。
- 二 政治的に公平であること。
- 三 報道は事実をまげないですること。
- 四 意見が対立している問題については、できるだけ多くの角度から論点を明らかにすること。

Official English translation:

(1) A broadcaster must comply with the following when editing domestic broadcast programs:

- (i) It must not negatively influence public safety or good morals.
- (ii) It must be politically fair.
- (iii) Reporting must not distort the facts.
- (iv) It must clarify the points at issue from as many angles as possible where there are conflicting opinions concerning an issue.

Ref: e-Gov (laws.e-gov.go.jp/law/325AC0000000132), Japanese Law Translation DB

Four Pillars of Bias Analysis

No.	Provision	SVFAB Analysis Reference
1	Must not harm public safety or good morals	Editorial baseline
2	Must be politically fair	Core bias metric — analogous to Swiss RTVG Art. 4
3	Reporting must not distort the facts	Factual dimension
4	Controversial issues: as many angles as possible	Multi-perspective / balance

Comparison Switzerland — Japan

Aspect	Switzerland (SRG)	Japan (NHK)
Law	RTVG Art. 4	Broadcasting Act Art. 4
Independent regulator	UBI (binding)	BPO (non-binding)



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

State regulator	BAKOM/UVEK	MIC (Ministry of Internal Affairs)
Enforcement	UBI can uphold complaints; BAKOM can sanction	BPO recommends; MIC can issue administrative guidance
Funding	Serafe fee	NHK reception fee (~1,100 JPY/month)
Self-regulation	Moderate (UBI independent)	Weak (BPO co-funded by NHK)

Regulatory Authorities

Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (総務省)

- Government ministry with jurisdiction over broadcasting
- Issues broadcast licences
- Can issue administrative guidance (行政指導)
- Approves NHK budget, business plan, and reception fees
- Theoretically has authority to revoke licences
- Recent action: September 2024, administrative guidance after Senkaku incident on NHK Radio International

BPO (Broadcasting Ethics and Program Improvement Organization)

- Founded 2003, non-governmental, self-regulatory
- Jointly operated by NHK and JBA (Japan Commercial Broadcasters Association)
- Three committees: Ethics Verification, Human Rights, Youth Protection
- Decisions are NOT legally binding — rely on voluntary compliance
- NHK co-funds BPO — structural independence compromised

Key BPO Decisions Regarding NHK

Year	Case	Ruling
2015	Close-up Gendai — staging allegations	Serious breach of broadcasting ethics
2022	BS Olympic Documentary (Naomi Kawase)	Serious breach — false subtitles
2023	News Watch 9 — COVID-19 reporting	Breach — vaccine families misrepresented

International Reference

- RSF Press Freedom Index: Japan 2024 Rank 70 (far behind CH: 9, NO: 1)
- Freedom House: Japan classified as "free", but media freedom under pressure (kisha clubs, government proximity)

Structural Background

NHK is the world's largest public broadcaster by budget (~720 billion JPY / ~4.5 billion EUR). Formal independence is structurally limited through the Board of Governors (12 members appointed by the Prime Minister with parliamentary consent). The kisha club system restricts access to government information to accredited media and fosters proximity between journalists and government.



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.